

# IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

In re:

W. R. GRACE & CO., et al.,

Debtors.

Chapter 11

Case No. 01-01139 (JKF) Jointly Administered

# W. R. Grace **Asbestos Personal Injury**

YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS OUES: IN APPENDIX A ATTACHED TO TI RELATED PERSONAL INJURY OR

IF YOU HAVE SUCH A CLAIM, YOU INC., THE CLAIMS PROCESSING A

DONE OR MORE OF THE DEBTORS LISTED TCY ON APRIL 2, 2001 FOR AN ASBESTOS-JLLY RESOLVED.

JANUARY 12, 2006 TO RUST CONSULTING.

TED PARCEL VERY SERVICE

RUPTCY

IF SENT BY U.S. MAIL

RUST CONSULTING CLAIMS PROCESSII RE: W.R. GRACE & P.O. BOX 1620 FARIBAULT, MN 5!

A QUESTIONNAIRE (AND ANY A

CONSIDERED UNLESS RECEIVED THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IS AN OFFICE

N WITH ESTIMATING GRACE'S ASBESTOS-WALLE IS BEING USED BY W. R. GRACE AS

OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE) WILL NOT BE

RELATED PERSONAL INJURY AND A MEANS TO SEEK INFORMATION ABOUT YOUR ASBESTOS CLAIM. BY TIMELY RETURNING THE QUESTIONNAIRE AS COMPLETELY AND ACCURATELY AS POSSIBLE, GRACE, THE OFFICIAL COMMITTEES, AND THE FUTURE CLAIMANTS REPRESENTATIVE WILL SEEK TO PRIORITIZE THE PROCESSING OF YOUR CLAIM UNDER ANY TRUST DISTRIBUTION PROCEDURES APPROVED AS PART OF A PLAN OF REORGANIZATION.

THE COURT HAS ORDERED THAT, AS PART OF THE DISCOVERY PROCESS, ALL HOLDERS OF PRE-PETITION ASBESTOS PERSONAL INJURY CLAIMS MUST COMPLETE AND RETURN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE. THUS, FAILURE TO TIMELY RETURN THE QUESTIONNAIRE AS COMPLETELY AND ACCURATELY AS POSSIBLE MAY RESULT IN SANCTIONS AND/OR OTHER RELIEF AVAILABLE UNDER APPLICABLE FEDERAL RULES.

BECAUSE YOUR CLAIM WILL BE EVALUATED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE TRUST DISTRIBUTION PROCEDURES APPROVED AS PART OF A PLAN OF REORGANIZATION, COMPLETION OF THIS QUESTIONNAIRE DOES NOT MEAN THAT YOUR CLAIM WILL EITHER BE ALLOWED OR PAID. TO THE EXTENT YOU ATTACH TO THIS QUESTIONNAIRE DOCUMENTS ALSO NEEDED BY THE TRUST TO PROCESS YOUR CLAIM, SUCH DOCUMENTS WILL BE PROVIDED TO THE TRUST AND YOU WILL NOT NEED TO RESUBMIT THEM.

# GENERAL

### INSTRUCTIONS



This Questionnaire refers to any lawsuit that you filed before April 2, 2001 for an "asbestos-related personal injury or wrongful de is intended to cover any lawsuit alleging any claim for personal injuries or damages that relates to: (a) exposure to any products or materials containing asbestos that were manufactured, sold, supplied, produced, specified, selected, distributed or in any way marketed by one or more of the Debtors (or any of their respective past or present affiliates, or any of the predecessors of any of the Debtors or any of their respective past or present affiliates), or (b) exposure to vermiculite mined, milled or processed by the Debtors (or any of their respective past or present affiliates, any of the predecessors of any of the Debtors or any of their predecessors' respective past or present affiliates). It includes claims in the nature of or sounding in tort, or under contract, warranty, guarantee, contribution, joint and several liability, subrogation, reimbursement, or indemnity, or any other theory of law or equity, or admiralty for, relating to, or arising out of, resulting from, or attributable to, directly or indirectly, death, bodily injury, sickness, disease, or other personal injuries or other damages caused, or allegedly caused, directly or indirectly, and arising or allegedly arising, directly or indirectly, from acts or omissions of one or more of the Debtors. It includes all such claims, debts, obligations or liabilities for compensatory damages such as loss of consortium, personal or bodily injury (whether physical, emotional or otherwise), wrongful death, survivorship, proximate, consequential, general, special, and punitive damages.

Your Questionnaire will be deemed filed only when it has been received by Rust Consulting Inc., the Claims Processing Agent, via U.S. Mail, Federal Express, United Parcel Service or similar hand delivery service. A Questionnaire that is submitted by facsimile, telecopy or other electronic transmission will not be accepted and will not be deemed filed.

Do not send any Questionnaire to the Debtors, counsel for the Debtors, the Future Claimants Representative, the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors, the Official Committee of Asbestos Personal Injury Claimants, the Official Committee of Asbestos Property Damage Claimants, the Official Committee of Equity Security Holders, or such Committees' counsel. Questionnaires that are filed with or sent to anyone other than Rust Consulting, Inc. will be deemed not to have been submitted, and such Questionnaires will not be considered.

- Your completed Questionnaire must (i) be written in English, and (ii) attach relevant supporting materials as instructed further below.
- All holders of claims described on page i (and as described in further detail in Instruction A (1) above) are required to file this Questionnaire by Jan. 12, 2006. Your Questionnaire will be used in connection with the estimation hearing to be conducted by the Court pursuant to the Estimation Procedures Order (a copy of which is attached as Appendix B).
- Any subsequent amendment to the Questionnaire will not be considered for any purpose unless received by Jan. 12, 2006.

B. PART I - Identity of Injured Person and Legal Counsel

Respond to all applicable questions. If you are represented by a lawyer, then in Part I (b), please provide your lawyer's name and the name, telephone number and address of his/her firm. If you are represented by a lawyer, he/she must assist in the completion of this Questionnaire. Also, if you would prefer that the Debtors send any additional materials only to your lawyer, instead of sending such materials to you, then check the box indicating this in Part I (b).

All references to "you" or the like in Parts I through X shall mean the injured person. If the injured person is deceased, then the executor of the person's will (or similar estate representative) must complete this Questionnaire.

C. PART II - Asbestos-Related Condition(s)

Please indicate all asbestos-related medical conditions for which you have been diagnosed. To complete questions related to injuries, medical diagnoses, and/or conditions, please use the following categories of customarily diagnosed conditions:

- Mesothelioma
- Asbestos-Related Lung Cancer
- Other Cancer (colon, laryngeal, esophageal, pharyngeal, or stomach)
- Clinically Severe Asbestosis
- Asbestosis
- Other Asbestos Disease

If you have been diagnosed with multiple conditions and/or if you received diagnoses and diagnostic tests relating to the same condition by multiple doctors, please complete a separate Part II for each initial diagnosis and any previous or subsequent diagnoses or diagnostic tests that change or conflict with the initial diagnosis. For your convenience, additional copies of Part II are attached as Appendix C to this Questionnaire.

Supporting Documents for Diagnosis: This Questionnaire must be accompanied by copies, with access to originals upon request, of any and all documents you, your counsel, or your doctors have or subsequently obtain that support or conflict with your diagnosis.

X-rays and B-reads: Please attach all x-ray reading and reports. You may, but are not required to, attach chest x-rays. The court, however, has ruled that Grace may seek access to chest x-rays upon request.

Pulmonary Function Tests: Please attach all pulmonary function test results, including the actual raw data and all spirometric tracings, on which the results are based.

In Part III, please provide the requested information for the job and site at which you were exposed to Grace asbestos-containing prodi of exposure to each Grace asbestos-containing product. If your exposure was a result of your employment, use the list of occupation and

to indicate your occupation and the industry in which you worked at each site. If you allege exposure to Grace asbestos-containing products at multiple sites, the Court has ordered that you must complete a separate Part III for each site. For your convenience, additional copies of Part III are attached as Appendix D to this Questionnaire.

Attach copies of any and all documents establishing that exposure to Grace asbestos-containing products had a substantial causal role in the development of

### Occupational Codes

- 01. Air conditioning and heating installer/maintenance
- Asbestos miner

į

- 03. Asbestos plant worker/asbestos manufacturing worker
- 04. Asbestos removal/abatement
- 05. Asbestos sprayer/spray gun mechanic
- 06. Assembly line/factory/plant worker
- 07. Auto mechanic/bodywork/brake repairman
- 08. Boilermaker
- Boiler repairman
- Boiler worker/cleaner/inspector/engineer/installer 10.
- 11. Building maintenance/building superintendent
- Brake manufacturer/installer
- 13. Brick mason/layer/hod carrier
- Burner operator 14.
- Carpenter/woodworker/cabinetmaker
- 16. Chipper
- 17. Clerical/office worker
- 18. Construction - general
- Custodian/janitor in office/residential building 19.
- 20. Custodian/janitor in plant/manufacturing facility
- 21. Electrician/inspector/worker
- 22. Engineer
- 23. Firefighter
- 24. Fireman
- Flooring installer/tile installer/tile mechanic 25.
- 26. Foundry worker
- 27. Furnace worker/repairman/installer
- Glass worker
- 29. Heavy equipment operator (includes truck, forklift, & crane) 59.
- 30. Insulator
- 001. Asbestos abatement/removal
- 002. Aerospace/aviation
- 100. Asbestos mining
- 101. Automotive
- 102. Chemical
- 103. Construction trades
- 104. Iron/steel
- 105. Longshore
- 106. Maritime
- 107. Military (other than U.S. Navy)
- 108. Non-asbestos products manufacturing

- 31. Iron worker
- 32. Joiner
- 33. Laborer
- Longshoreman
- 35. Machinist/machine operator
- Millwright/mill worker 36.
- Mixer/bagger
- 38. Non-asbestos miner
- Non-occupational/residential 39.
- 40. Painter
- 41. Pipefitter
- 42 Plasterer
- 43. Plumber - install/repair
- Power plant operator
- 45. Professional (e.g., accountant, architect, physician)
- Railroad worker/carman/brakeman/machinist/conductor
- Refinery worker
- Remover/installer of gaskets 48.
- 49. Rigger/stevedore/seaman
- 50. Rubber/tire worker
- 51. Sandblaster
- 52. Sheet metal worker/sheet metal mechanic
- Shipfitter/shipwright/ship builder
- 54 Shipyard worker (md. repair, maintenance)
- 55. Steamfitter
- Steelworker 57.
- Warehouse worker 58.
- Welder/blacksmith
- Other

# **Industry Codes**

- 109. Petrochemical
- 110. Railroad
- 111. Shipyard-construction/repair
- 112. Textile
- 113. Tire/rubber
- 114. U.S. Navy
- 115. Utilities
- Grace asbestos manufacture or milling 117, Non-Grace asbestos manufacture or milling
- 118. Other

In Part IV, please provide the information requested for any injury alleged to have been caused by exposure to Grace asbestos-contain contact/proximity with another injured person. If you allege exposure through contact/proximity with multiple injured persons, pleat Part IV for each injured person. For your convenience, additional copies of Part IV are attached as Appendix E to this Questionnaire.

# F. PART V - Exposure to Non-Grace Asbestos-Containing Products

In Part V, please provide the requested information for each party against which you have filed a lawsuit and/or claim alleging exposure to asbestos-containing products other than Grace products. If you filed such lawsuits and/or claims against multiple parties, the Court has ordered that you must complete a separate Part V for each party. If exposure was in connection with your employment, use the list of occupation and industry codes in Part III to indicate your occupation and the industry in which you worked. For your convenience, additional copies of Part V are attached as Appendix F to this Questionnaire.

### G. PART VI - Employment History

In Part VI, please provide the information requested for each industrial job you have held, other than jobs already listed in Parts III or V. Use the list of occupation and industry codes in the instructions to Part III to indicate your occupation and the industry in which you worked for each job. Please use the copy of Part VI attached as Appendix G to this Questionnaire if additional space is needed,

# H. PART VII - Litigation and Claims Regarding Asbestos and/or Silica

In Part VII, please describe any lawsuits and/or claims that were filed by you or on your behalf regarding asbestos or silica.

# L PART VIII - Claims by Dependents or Related Persons

Part VIII is to be completed only by dependents or related persons (such as spouse or child) of an injured person who sued the Debtors before April 2, 2001 for an asbestos-related personal injury or wrongful death claim against Grace not involving physical injury to him-/herself on account of his/her own exposure. One example of such a claim would be a claim for loss of consortium. If you are asserting such a claim, complete the entire Questionnaire, providing all information and documentation regarding the injured person.

# J. PART IX - Supporting Documentation

In Part IX, please mark the boxes next to each type of document that you are submitting with this Questionnaire. As indicated in the instructions to Parts II and III, this Questionnaire must be accompanied by copies, with access to originals upon request, of any and all documents you, your counsel, or your doctors have or subsequently obtain that (a) support or conflict with your diagnosis and/or (b) establish exposure to Grace asbestos-containing products as having a substantial causal role in the development of the medical diagnoses, and/or conditions claimed. Original documents provided to Grace will be returned within a reasonable time after its professionals and experts have reviewed the documents.

Grace will reimburse your reasonable expenses incurred in providing (a) copies of depositions you have given in lawsuits in which Grace was not a party and/or (b) any documents you have previously provided to Grace in prior litigation. Please indicate the documents for which you are seeking reimbursement and attach a receipt for such cost.

K PART X - Attestation that Information is True, Accurate and Complete

By signing Part X, you, the injured person, are attesting and swearing, under penalty of perjury, that, to the best of your knowledge, all of the information in this Questionnaire is true, accurate and complete. If the injured person is deceased, then the executor of the person's will (or similar estate representative) must complete and sign Part X on behalf of the injured person.

The legal representative of the injured person must complete and sign Part X where indicated.

141111 2007		PARTI	DENTELY OF PAI	HEO PERSON ASI	Hasai e	arsari.				
	<u> </u>							WF.	GRACI	
а.	GENERAL INFORMAT	ON	REDACTED			~				
1.	Name of Claimant:				2.	Gender:	Ø	Male		Female
		First	MI	Last						
3.	Race (for purposes of eval	luating Pulmona	ry Function Test resul	lts): <u>See At</u>	tached PFT,	if applicable			/Cauca	
			REDAC	TED				Alrıca Other	n Ame	erican
4.	Last Four Digits of Social	Security Numbe	e <b>r:</b>		5. Birth	Date:		Out.		
6.	Mailing Address:	ddress		City		Ohan Durailia		17° 10		
7.	Daytime Telephone Numl			•		State/Province 61) 547-8051		Z.ip/P	ostal C	ode
ь.	LAWYER'S NAME AND					01) 547-8051			<del></del>	·
1.		latalie Duncan	4.0000 4. 3			ŧ				
2. 3.	Name of Law Firm With			Baron & Budd.	, P.C.					
Э,	Mailing Address of Firm:	Address	ak Lawn Ave. Suite 110	00 <u>Dallas</u> City	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	TX State/Provi	nce		19-428 Postal	Code
4.	Law Firm's Telephone Nu	ımber or Lawver	's Direct Line:			(214)521-360	)5	•		
			btors to send subsequen		_			of send	ling su	ch
c.	CAUSE OF DEATH (IF A	APPLICABLE)								
1.	Is the injured person livin	g or deceased? .				D 1	Living		J De	ceased
	If deceased, date of death	;			_	01/28/2004				
2.	If the injured person is declering:	eased, then attac	ch a copy of the death	certification to this	Questionnair	e and comple	ete the	:		
	Primary Cause of De	ath (as stated in	the Death Certificate)	): <u>S</u>	ee attached d	eath certificat	e			
	Contributing Cause of	f Death (as state	d in the Death Certifi	cate):	See atta	ched death ce	rtifica	te		
			PARETE ASBESTO	ARTIATED COND	THORS					
Same or dia	the box next to the condition tionnaire. If you have been di condition by multiple doctors agnostic tests that change or andix C to this Questionnaire.	s with which you hagnosed with mult please complete a conflict with the in	have been diagnosed an tiple conditions and/or i a separate Part II for eac nitial diagnosis. For yo	d provide all informati if you received diagnos h initial diagnosis and our convenience, addit	ion required in ses and diagno any previous ional conies o	ostic tests rela or subsequent	ting to	the		
1.	Please check the box next		being alleged:							
		Cancer	☐ Meso	othelioma						_
	☐ Asbestosis			er Cancer (cancer no		lung cancer	or me	sotheli	oma)	•
	Other Asbestos Disease	ning Macathali		cally Severe Asbestos						
•	a. Mesothelioma: If alle				thelioma base	d on the follow	wing (	check a	ll that	apply):
				ard at Uathalass						
			ed by the American Boat t certified by the Ameri		***					•
	diagnosis from a	second pathologist	t certified by the Ameri orting exposure to Grace	can Board of Patholog		ng a substanti	al cas	ual role	in the	•

REC'D JUL 11 2006

# PARTUL ASRESTRIS-RELIATED COMPTRONGS (Continued)

|--|

b. Asbestos-Related Lung Cancer: If alleging Asbestos-Related Lung Cancer, were you diagnosed with primary lung cance (check all that apply): Subject to the foregoing objections, one or more of the following may apply. The answer manattached medical documentation.

	-14014	managed to section and the sec									
	find	lings by a pathologist certified by the American Board of Pathology									
	set	idence of asbestosis based on a chest x-ray reading of at least 1/1 on the ILO grade scale (a) conducted in compliance with the standards to forth in the International Labour Organization's 2000 International Classification of Radiographs of Pneumoconioses and (b) by a Bader certified by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health									
	set	idence of asbestosis based on a chest x-ray reading of at least 1/1 on the ILO grade scale (a) conducted in compliance with the standards t forth in the International Labour Organization's 2000 International Classification of Radiographs of Pneumoconioses and (b) by a second reader certified by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health									
	evi	dence of asbestosis determined by pathology									
0	con	dence of asbestos-related nonmalignant disease based on a chest x-ray reading of at least 1/0 on the ILO grade scale (a) conducted in upliance with the standards set forth in the International Labour Organization's 2000 International Classification of Radiographs of umoconioses and (b) by a B-reader certified by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health									
	con	dence of asbestos-related nonmalignant disease based on a chest x-ray reading of at least 1/0 on the ILO grade scale (a) conducted in upliance with the standards set forth in the International Labour Organization's 2000 International Classification of Radiographs of umoconioses and (b) by a second B-reader certified by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health									
		use pleural thickening as defined in the International Labour Organization's Guidelines for the Use of the ILO International ssification of Radiographs and Pneumoconioses (2000)									
		apporting medical diagnosis and supporting documentation establishing that exposure to Grace asbestos-containing products had a stantial causal role in the development of the lung cancer									
	oth	er (please specify):									
Othe	r Ca	ncer;									
(i)	If a	lleging Other Cancer, please mark the box(es) next to the applicable primary cancer(s) being alleged:									
		colon									
		other, please specify:									
(ii)	Wes	re you diagnosed with the above-indicated cancer based on the following (check all that apply):									
		findings by a pathologist certified by the American Board of Pathology									
		evidence of asbestosis based on a chest x-ray reading of at least 1/1 on the ILO grade scale (a) conducted in compliance with the standards set forth in the International Labour Organization's 2000 International Classification of Radiographs of Pneumoconioses and (b) by a B-reader certified by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health									
		evidence of asbestosis based on a chest x-ray reading of at least 1/1 on the ILO grade scale (a) conducted in compliance with the standards set forth in the International Labour Organization's 2000 International Classification of Radiographs of Pneumoconioses and (b) by a second B-reader certified by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health									
		evidence of asbestosis determined by pathology									
	0	a supporting medical diagnosis and supporting documentation establishing that exposure to Grace asbestos-containing products had a substantial causal role in the development of the cancer									
		other (please specify):									

# 385766

# PALITIE ASBESTOS RELATED CONVERGNESS (Combination



Clinically Severe Asbestosis: If alleging Clinically Severe Asbestosis, was your diagnosis based on the following (chei diagnosis of a pulmonologist or internist certified by the American Board of Internal Medicine a chest x-ray reading of at least 2/1 on the ILO grade scale (a) conducted in compliance with the standards set forth in the International Labour Organization's 2000 International Classification of Radiographs of Pneumocontoses and (b) by a B-reader certified by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health a chest x-ray reading of at least 2/1 on the ILO grade scale (a) conducted in compliance with the standards set forth in the International Labour Organization's 2000 International Classification of Radiographs of Pneumoconioses and (b) by a second B-reader certified by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health asbestosis determined by pathology a pulmonary function test, conducted in accordance with the standards set forth in the American Thoracic Society's Lung Function Testing; Selection of Reference Values and Interpretive Strategies, demonstrating total lung capacity less than 65% predicted a pulmonary function test, conducted in accordance with the standards set forth in the American Thoracic Society's Lung Function Testing; Selection of Reference Values and Interpretive Strategies, demonstrating forced vital capacity less than 65% predicted and a FEV1/FVC ratio greater than or equal to 65% predicted a supporting medical diagnosis and supporting documentation establishing that exposure to Grace asbestos-containing products had a substantial causal role in the development of the asbestosis other (please specify); Asbestosis: If alleging Asbestosis, was your diagnosis based on the following (check all that apply): diagnosis of a pulmonologist or internist certified by the American Board of Internal Medicine a chest x-ray reading conducted in compliance with the standards set forth in the International Labour Organization's 2000 International Classification of Radiographs of Pneumoconioses by a B-reader certified by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, with one of the following: (i) at least 1/0 on the ILO grade scale, or (ii) diffuse pleural thickening as defined in the ILO's Guidelines for the Use of the ILO International Classification of Radiographs and Pneumoconioses (2000) a chest x-ray reading conducted in compliance with the standards set forth in the International Labour Organization's 2000 International Classification of Radiographs of Pneumoconioses by a second B-reader certified by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, with one of the following: (i) at least 1/0 on the ILO grade scale, or (ii) diffuse pleural thickening as defined in the ILO's Guidelines for the Use of the ILO International Classification of Radiographs and Pneumoconioses (2000) asbestosis determined by pathology a pulmonary function test, conducted in accordance with the standards set forth in the American Thoracic Society's Lung Function Testing; Selection of Reference Values and Interpretive Strategies, demonstrating a FEV1/FVC ratio greater than or equal to 65% predicted with either (a) total lung capacity less than 80% predicted or (b) forced vital capacity less than 80% predicted

a supporting medical diagnosis and supporting documentation establishing that exposure to Grace asbestos-containing products had a

substantial causal role in the development of the asbestosis

other (please specify):

# 34475 74475

# PAGE IL ASBESTOS-RELATED PERBUTION(S) (Co-timed)


f. Other Ashestos Disease: If alleging any ashestos-related injuries, medical diagnoses, and/or conditions other than diagnosis based on the following (check all that apply):

5027-0008

	construction of the constr
	diagnosis of a pulmonologist or internist certified by the American Board of Internal Medicine
	diagnosis determined by pathology
	a chest x-ray conducted in compliance with the standards set forth in the International Labour Organization's 2000 International Classification of Radiographs of Pneumoconioses by a B-reader certified by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, with one of the following (i) at least 1/0 on the ILO grade scale, or (ii) diffuse pleural thickening as defined in the ILO's Guidelines for the Use of the ILO International Classification of Radiographs and Pneumoconioses (2000)
	a chest x-ray conducted in compliance with the standards set forth in the International Labour Organization's 2000 International Classification of Radiographs of Pneumoconioses by a second B-reader certified by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, with one of the following (i) at least 1/0 on the ILO grade scale, or (ii) diffuse pleural thickening as defined in the ILO's Guidelines for the Use of the ILO International Classification of Radiographs and Pneumoconioses (2000)
	a chest x-ray reading other than those described above
	a pulmonary function test, conducted in accordance with the standards set forth in the American Thoracic Society's Lung Function Testing; Selection of Reference Values and Interpretive Strategies, demonstrating a FEV1/FVC ratio greater than or equal to 65% predicted with either (a) total lung capacity less than 80% predicted or (b) forced vital capacity less than 80% predicted
□.	a pulmonary function test other than that discussed above
	a supporting medical diagnosis and supporting documentation establishing that exposure to Grace asbestos-containing products had a substantial causal role in the development of the condition
	A CT Scan or similar testing
	a diagnosis other than those above
	other (please specify):

[REMAINDER OF PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK]

tuent Marten		PART II ASBESTOS RELECTED CONDITIONS (Comment)		
2.	Information Regarding Diagnost attached hereto.	s Subject to the foregoing objections, please refer to claimant's responses below and	WR GRAC	E PIQ 350:
	Date of Diagnosis:		_	
	Diagnosing Doctor's Name:	Parmar, Jaywant , M.D.		
	Diagnosing Doctor's Specialty:			
	Diagnosing Doctor's Mailing Add			
	Wheeling	wv	26003	
	City	State/Province	Zip/Postal	Code
	Diagnosing Doctor's Daytime Tel	ephone Number:		
		to the diagnosing doctor, check all applicable boxes: Subject to the foregoing objecti	ons, please	refer to
	Was the diagnosing doctor your	personal physician? Yes	×	No
	Was the diagnosing doctor paid	for the diagnostic services that he/she performed? Yes		No
	If yes, please indicate who paid Did you retain counsel in order to re refer to the foregoing objections.	for the services performed:  Claimant paid for the services through his/her counsel.  ceive any of the services performed by the diagnosing doctor? Please  Yes	No	
	Claimant objects to this question question cannot be answered with through Claimant's counsel to pro-	to you by counsel?	No	
	Are you aware of any relationship be	etween the diagnosing doctor and your legal counsel? Yes	No	
	to pr	nant objects to this question since "relationship" is vague and ambiguous; therefore, iswered with either a "yes" or a "no." The doctor was retained by Claimant through ovide expert medical opinions in Claimant's Asbestos Lawsuit as needed to establish unant's claim under state law.	Claimant	faconneal
	Was the diagnosing doctor certifi at the time of the diagnosis?	ed as a pulmonologist or internist by the American Board of Internal Medicine  N/A	Π Ves	□ No
	Was the diagnosing doctor	certified as a pathologist by the American Board of Pathology at	the time	
	Was the diagnosing doctor diagnosis?	provided with your complete occupational, medical and smoking	history Yes	prior to
			□ Yes	П №
		lucts? See attached interrogatory responses, if applicable		

Start Year

Start Year

Start Year

☐ Yes ☐ No

**End Year** 

End Year

**End Year** 

Have you ever used tobacco products? ..... See attached interrogatory responses, if applicable  $\square$  Yes  $\square$  No If answer to either question is yes, please indicate whether you have regularly used any of the following tobacco products and the dates and

frequency with which such products were used: See attached interrogatory responses, if applicable.

Have you ever been diagnosed with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease ("COPD")?

If yes, please attach all documents regarding such diagnosis and explain the nature of the diagnosis:

Packs Per Day (half pack = .5)

If Other Tobacco Products, please specify (e.g., chewing tobacco): Amount Per Day

Cigars Per Day

See attached medical documentation, if applicable

See attached medical documentation, if applicable

Cigarettes

Cigars

3;·	Information Regardin	g Chest X	-Ray									ŀ	168112111		
	Please check the box r please refer to attache	ext to the	applicable	location	on where you nd attached i	r chest i medical	c-ray was taker documentation	n (check	one): <u>Sub</u>	<u>iect to</u>	the fore	V	VR GRAC	E PIC	350
	☐ Mobile laboratory		Job site		Union Hall				Hospital		Other:				
	Address where chest	ray take	n:						-			_			
				Ad	dress										
	City	·			···	<u> </u>	State/Province	70				7:-	/Postal	Codo	-
			PARTA	I ASI	a seos ace	AFID	CONDITION	CONTRACTOR	iriiciti						
4.	Information Regardin	g Chest X	-Ray Read	ing <u>S</u> u	ibject to the f	oregoin	g objections, pl	ease refe	r to respo	nses be	low and	l att	ached	medic	al
	Date of Reading:	08/25/20	004					πο	score:	1/1					
	Name of Reader:	Lucas, P	hilip H., M.											• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
	Reader's Daytime Tel							(601)66	3_1280						
	Reader's Mailing Add	-		ba Cou	inty Hospital				7-1200	•					
	Philadelphia						MS					393	50		
	City						State/Provinc	_				•	/Postal		
	With respect to your r									ections	please	refe	er to re	spons	<u>es</u>
	Was the reader paid for	the servic	es that he/sl	ne perfo	ormed							×	Yes		No
	If yes, please indicate w	ho paid fo	r the servic	es perfe	ormed:		Claimant paid	d for the	services thr	ough h	is/her co	uns	el.		
	Did you retain counsel	in order to													
	objections.  Was the reader referred	to you by	counsel? .			rmed by							Yes Yes		
	Was the reader referred Claimant objects to the answered with either a provide expert medica claim under state law.	to you by is question "yes" or l opinions	counsel? . n since "rei a "no." T. in Claiman	ferred he doc nt's As	to you" is vag tor was retair bestos Lawsu	gue and ned by C	ambiguous; the laimant throug ded to establis	erefore, gh Claim sh the ele	the question ant's counterments of (	n canr sel to Ilaima	ot be		Yes		No
	objections.  Was the reader referred Claimant objects to th answered with either a provide expert medica	to you by is question i "yes" or l opinions lationship Clat be a to p	counsel? n since "rel a "no." T. in Claiman between the imant object inswered w rovide expe	ferred he doct of's As e reader ets to fl ith eith ert med	to you" is vag tor was retain bestos Lawsu r and your leg his question s ter a "yes" of lical opinions	gue and ned by Cuit as need al counse since "re r a "no."	ambiguous; the laimant throug ded to establis	erefore, gh Claim sh the ele vague an	the questic ant's coun ments of ( d ambigue and by Cla	on cannot sel to laimant	ot be	the Cl	Yes Yes question	on car	No No
	Was the reader referred Claimant objects to the answered with either a provide expert medical claim under state law. Are you aware of any read of the state of th	to you by is question "yes" or l opinions lationship Cla: be a to p Cla:	counsel? n since "rel a "no." T. in Claiman between the imant object nswered w rovide experimant's claimant's claimant	ferred he doct at's As e reade; ets to the eith eith eith ert medim und	to you" is vag tor was retain bestos Lawsu r and your leg his question s ner a "yes" of lical opinions ler state law.	gue and ned by Cuit as need al counse ince "re ra "no." in Clair	ambiguous; the daimant through ded to establis al?  lationship" is the doctor we mant's Asbesto	erefore, gh Claim h the ele vague an vas retain s Lawsu	the questic ant's coun ments of C d ambigue ded by Cla it as neede	on came sel to Claima ous; the imant d to es	nt's erefore, through	the Cl	Yes Yes question	on car	mot
	was the reader referred Claimant objects to the answered with either a provide expert medica claim under state law. Are you aware of any re	to you by is question a "yes" or l opinions lationship  Claibe a to p  Claied by the	counsel? n since "rel a "no." T. in Claiman between the imant object inswered w rovide experimant's clai National In	ferred he doct he doct he reader to the cith eithert med mund stitute	to you" is vag tor was retain bestos Lawsu r and your leg his question s aer a "yes" of dical opinions ler state law.	gue and ned by Cuit as need al counse ince "re ra "no." in Clair	ambiguous; the claimant throug eded to establis el?  clationship" is v The doctor w mant's Asbesto	erefore, gh Claim th the ele wague an ras retain to Lawsu	the question and's countents of Countents of Countents of Countents of Countents of Countents of the counten	on came sel to Claima ous; the imant d to es	oot be nt's erefore, through	the Clithe	Yes Yes question	on car	No No
	objections.  Was the reader referred Claimant objects to the answered with either a provide expert medical claim under state law.  Are you aware of any reading the state of t	to you by is question "yes" or l opinions lationship  Clai be a to p Clai ed by the	counsel? n since "rel a "no." T. in Claiman between the imant object inswered w rovide experiment's claimant.	ferred he docint's As e reader to the cith eith eith end und stitute	to you" is vag tor was retain bestos Lawsu r and your leg his question s ter a "yes" of lical opinions ler state law.	gue and ned by Cuit as need by Cuit as need ince "re ra "no." in Clair	ambiguous; the claimant through ded to establis al?  clationship" is to the doctor we mant's Asbesto	erefore, gh Claim th the ele wague an was retain to Lawsu	the questic ant's coun ments of ( d ambigue ned by Cla it as neede	on cannisel to Claiman ous; the imant d to es	ot be nt's erefore, through tablish g?	the Clithe	Yes Yes questic simant	on cars couts of	No No mot nsel
í,	Was the reader referred Claimant objects to the answered with either a provide expert medical claim under state law. Are you aware of any reader of any reader explain:  Was the reader certification.	to you by is question "yes" or I opinions lationship  Claibe a to p Claibe d by the crified B-imade:	counsel? n since "rel a "no." T. in Claiman between the imant object inswered w rovide experiment's claim National In reader, plea	ferred he doct of s As e reader to the cith eith eith ert medim und stitute	to you" is vag tor was retain bestos Lawsu r and your leg- his question s her a "yes" of lical opinions ler state law. for Occupati	gue and ned by Cuit as nee al counse ince "re r a "no. ' in Clair ional Sai	ambiguous; the claimant through ded to establis el?  Ilationship" is a The doctor want's Asbesto fety and Health spation, special.	erefore, gh Claim, the electric wague an ras retain as Lawsun at the t	the question and's country of Country of Country of Country of the	on came sel to Claiman cous; the imant d to es readin	ot be nt's erefore, through tablish g?	the Clathe	Yes Yes questic simant	on cars couts of	No No mot nsel
·•	Was the reader referred Claimant objects to the answered with either a provide expert medical claim under state law. Are you aware of any reader of any reader explain:  Was the reader explain:  If the reader is not a combich the reading was Information Regarding	to you by is question a "yes" or l opinions lationship Claibe a to p Claibed by the critified B-amade:	counsel? n since "rel a "no." T. in Claiman between the imant object mswered w rovide experiment's claim National In reader, pleas ary Function ached PFT.	ferred he doct he doct he reade test to the test hert med im und stitute here here here here here here here he	to you" is vag tor was retain bestos Lawsu r and your leg- his question s ner a "yes" of lical opinions ler state law. for Occupations wribe the readance:	gue and ned by Cuit as ned ince "re ra "no." in Clair ince al counse ince "re ra "no." in Clair in Cla	ambiguous; the claimant through ded to establis el?  Ilationship" is well at the doctor we mant's Asbesto fety and Health apation, special egoing objection	erefore, gh Claim h the ele ele ele ele ele ele ele ele ele e	the question and's country of Country of Country of Country of the	on came sel to Claiman cous; the imant d to es readin	ot be nt's erefore, through tablish g?	the Clathe	Yes Yes questionimant elemen	Don can se sout to of	No No nnot nsel
i,	Was the reader referred Claimant objects to the answered with either a provide expert medical claim under state law. Are you aware of any reading the state of any reader certification. Was the reader certification of the reading was information Regarding refer to responses belowered.	to you by is question a "yes" or I opinions lationship Claibe a to p Claibed by the crified B-amade:  g Pulmons w and att:	counsel? n since "rel a "no." T. in Claiman between the imant object inswered w rovide experiment's clai National In reader, plea ary Function ached PFT. es when tes	ferred he doct at's As e reader to fi ith eith ert med im und astitute as e description Test:	to you" is vag tor was retain bestos Lawsu r and your leg his question s her a "yes" of lical opinions ler state law. for Occupati cribe the read.  Subject to	gue and ned by Cuit as need by Cuit as need ince "re ra "no." in Claim in C	ambiguous; the claimant through ded to establis al?  clationship" is a The doctor we mant's Asbesto fety and Health apation, special going objection and claim applicable	erefore, gh Claim h the ele ele ele ele ele ele ele ele ele e	the question and's country of Country of Country of Country of the	on came sel to Claiman cous; the imant d to es readin	or be	the Clathe	Yes Yes questionimant elemen	Don can se sout to of	No No not nsel No
<b>5</b> ,	Was the reader referred Claimant objects to the answered with either a provide expert medical claim under state law. Are you aware of any reader of any reader explain:  Was the reader explain:  Was the reader certification.  Was the reader is not a complete to response below List your height in feet	to you by is question a "yes" or l opinions lationship Claibe a to p Claibed by the critified B-amade:  g Pulmona w and att: t and inch	counsel? n since "rel a "no." T. in Claiman between the imant object mswered w rovide expeimant's clai National In reader, pleas ary Function ached PFT. es when test a test given:	ferred he doct he doct to the transfer mede to the transfer mede to the transfer med t	to you" is vage tor was retain bestos Lawsur and your leg this question seer a "yes" of lical opinions ler state law.  for Occupation of the reader is the r	gue and ned by Cuit as need by Cuit as need ince "re ra "no." in Claim in C	ambiguous; the claimant through ded to establis al?  clationship" is a The doctor we mant's Asbesto fety and Health apation, special going objection and claim applicable	erefore, gh Claim h the ele ele ele ele ele ele ele ele ele e	the questice ant's countents of () d ambiguoused by Clasit as needesime of the countents of	on came sel to Claiman cous; the imant d to es readin	erefore, through tablish	the Clathe	Yes  Yes  questionimant elemen  Yes	on can	No No nnot nsel No ches
i,	Was the reader referred Claimant objects to the answered with either a provide expert medical claim under state law. Are you aware of any reader of any reader state law. Was the reader certification of the reading was information Regarding refer to responses below List your height in positive of the reader in positive control of the reader in the reading was information regarding refer to responses below the reader in the reading was information regarding refer to responses below the reader in the reading was information regarding refer to responses below the reader in	to you by is question a "yes" or I opinions lationship Claibe a to p Claibe d by the crified Banade:  g Pulmons w and attain and inchaineds when ILC): See	counsel? n since "rei a "no." T. in Claiman between the imant object inswered w rovide experiment's clai National In reader, plea ary Functio ached PFT. es when test it test given:	ferred he doct he doct he reader test to the fifth eith ert medim und stitute new description of the fifth ert medim und stitute he description of the fifth ert medim und stitute he description of the fifth ert medim und stitute he description of the fifth ert media and	to you" is vag tor was retain bestos Lawsu r and your leg his question s her a "yes" of lical opinions for Occupati cribe the read  Subject to h: See Attach Attached PF	gue and ned by Cuit as ned ince "re ra "no." in Clair ional Saiter's occur the fore hed PFT	ambiguous; the claimant through ded to establis al?  clationship" is a The doctor we mant's Asbesto fety and Health apation, special going objection and claim applicable	erefore, gh Claim h the ele ele ele ele ele ele ele ele ele e	the questic ant's countents of C d ambiguous ded by Cla it as needed ime of the case method	ous; the imant d to es reading	or be of s  erefore, through tablish  g?  h	fhe a Chithe	Yes  Yes  question  imant' elemen  Yes  2000	on can s cou ts of	No No not nsel No ches
5.	Was the reader referred Claimant objects to the answered with either a provide expert medical claim under state law. Are you aware of any reader of any reader of any reader explain:  Was the reader explain:  Was the reader certification of the reading was linformation Regarding refer to responses below List your height in feet List your weight in portional Lung Capacity (Forced Vital Capacity)	to you by is question "yes" or I opinions lationship  Claibe a to p Clai	counsel? n since "rel a "no." T. in Claimal between the imant object inswered w rovide experiment's clai National In reader, plea ary Function ached PFT. es when test test given: e Attached fee Attached	ferred he doct of s As e reader to the cith eith eith ert med im und astitute as e described in Test. It given to give the cith ert give t	to you" is vag tor was retain bestos Lawsu r and your leg his question s her a "yes" of lical opinions her state law. for Occupation cribe the read  Subject to h: See Attack Attached PF; f applicable his applicable	gue and ned by Cuit as ned ince "re ra "no." in Clair ional Saiter's occur the fore hed PFT	ambiguous; the claimant through ded to establis al?  clationship" is a The doctor we mant's Asbesto fety and Health apation, special going objection and claim applicable	erefore, gh Claim h the ele ele ele ele ele ele ele ele ele e	d ambigue ned by Cla it as neede ime of the Date of	on came sel to Claiman cous; the imant do es readin throug	erefore, through tablish g?	the a Clathe	Yes  Yes  questing  questi	on can s cou ts of	No No Ches lbs cted
Š.	Was the reader referred Claimant objects to the answered with either a provide expert medical claim under state law. Are you aware of any reader of any reader of any reader certification. Was the reader certification of the reading was Information Regarding refer to responses below List your weight in post Total Lung Capacity (Forced Vital Capacity FEV1/FVC Ratio: See	to you by is question a "yes" or I opinions lationship Claibe a to p Claibe d by the striffed B-amade:  g Pulmons w and attained inch inds when IT.C: Sea (FVC): Sea Attached	counsel? n since "rei a "no." T. in Claiman between the imant object inswered w rovide experiment's clai National In reader, plea ary Function ached PFT. es when tes test given: e Attached dee Attached	ferred he doct he doct he reade test to the fifth eithert medium und stitute new description of the fifth ert medium und stitute he description of the fifth ert medium und stitute he description of the fifth ert medium und stitute he description of the fifth ert fif	to you" is vag tor was retain bestos Lawsu r and your leg his question s her a "yes" of lical opinions for Occupati  ribe the read  Subject to  See Attack Attached PFT f applicable if applicable	gue and ned by Cuit as ned al counse ince "re ra "no." in Clair ince al counse in Clair in Cl	ambiguous; the claimant through ded to establis all the claimant of the claim and the	erefore, gh Claim the electron wague an was retains Lawsu h at the f	d ambigue ned by Cla it as neede ime of the Date of	on came sel to Claiman cous; the imant do es readin throug	or be of s  erefore, through tablish  g?  h	the a Clathe	Yes  Yes  question  imant' elemen  Yes  2000	on can s cou ts of	No No Ches lbs cted
5.	Was the reader referred Claimant objects to the answered with either a provide expert medical claim under state law. Are you aware of any reader of any read	to you by is question "yes" or I opinions lationship Claibe a to p Claibe d by the criffed B-rade:  g Pulmons w and attained when IT.C): See (FVC): See Attached	counsel? n since "rel a "no." T. in Claiman between the imant object inswered w rovide experiment's clai National In reader, plea ary Function ached PFT. es when test test given: e Attached fee Attached t (if applica	ferred he doct he reader test to flith eithert med mund estitute new description Test test given PFT, i d PFT, plicable):	to you" is vag tor was retain bestos Lawsu r and your leg his question s her a "yes" of lical opinions her state law. for Occupation cribe the read  Subject to h: See Attack Attached PF; f applicable his applicable	gue and ned by Cuit as ned al counse ince "re ra "no." in Clair ince al counse in Clair in Cl	ambiguous; the claimant through ded to establis al?  clationship" is a The doctor we mant's Asbesto fety and Health apation, special going objection and claim applicable	erefore, gh Claim the electron wague an was retains Lawsu h at the f	d ambigue ned by Cla it as neede ime of the Date of	on came sel to Claiman cous; the imant do es readin throug	erefore, through tablish g?	the a Clathe	Yes  Yes  questing  questi	on can s cou ts of	No No Ches lbs cted
<b>;</b> ,	Was the reader referred Claimant objects to the answered with either a provide expert medical claim under state law. Are you aware of any reader of any reader of any reader certification. Was the reader certification of the reading was Information Regarding refer to responses below List your weight in post Total Lung Capacity (Forced Vital Capacity FEV1/FVC Ratio: See	to you by is question "yes" or I opinions lationship  Claibe a to p Clai	counsel? n since "rel a "no." T. in Claiman between the imant object inswered w rovide experiment's claim National In reader, plea ary Function ached PFT. es when test a test given: e Attached bee Attached c PFT, if applican t (if applican ttached PFT	ferred he doct he doct he reader to the ith eithert med mund stitute to give he see description of the property of the propert	to you" is vage tor was retain bestos Lawsur and your leg his question saler a "yes" of lical opinions ler state law.  for Occupation of the readal opinions ler state law.  Subject to be see Attack Attacked PFT fapplicable if applicable lee	gue and ned by Cuit as ned ince "re ra "no." in Clair in	ambiguous; the claimant through ded to establis all the claimant of the claim and the	vague an vas retains Lawsu hat the f	d ambiguenced by Clair as needed ime of the Date of 124 92 61	on came sel to Claiman cous; the imant do es readin throug	erefore, through tablish g?	the a Clathe	Yes  Yes  questing  questi	on can s cou ts of	No No not nsel No ches lbs cted

Was the testing doctor and/or clinician paid for the services he/she performed?	C	<u> </u>					i			
Name of Doctor Interpreting Test: Petroff, Peter Doctor's Specialty: PULMONOLOGIST Interpreting Doctor's Mailing Address: Independent Medical Associates, P.A. Address San Antonio TX 78229 City State/Province Zip/Postal Code Interpreting Doctor's Daytime Telephone Number: Q10614-6578  FARI IN SUBSUINS ADDRESS OF TAX Q10614-6578  FARI IN SUBSUINS ADDRESS OF TAX Q10614-6578  With respect to your relationship to the doctor or Citalcian who performed the pulmonary function test check all applicable boxes: Subsuince of the foregoing objections, please refer to response below. If the test was performed by a doctor, was the doctor your personal physician?	_	ity			State/Province		V	VR GRAI	CE P	11 3E
Dector's Specialty: PULMONOLOGIST Interpreting Doctor's Mailling Address: Independent Medical Associates, P.A. Address San Antonio State/Province Zap/Fostal Code Interpreting Doctor's Daytime Telephone Number:	T	esting Doctor or Clinicia	n's Daytime Telepho	ne Number:	See Attached PFT, if appl	licable ()	<u> </u>			
Interpreting Doctor's Mailing Address:   Independent Medical Associates, P.A.	N	ame of Doctor Interpreti	ing Test:F	'etroff, Peter			_			
Address  TX 78229  City State/Province	D	octor's Specialty:	PULMONOLOGIST							
City State/Province	ħ	aterpreting Doctor's Mai	ling Address:		dical Associates, P.A.	••••				
Interpreting Doctor's Daytime Telephone Number:   C2 D\(\text{Dist}(4-5378\)   CANUH: AS\(\text{Dist}(AS\)   CANUH: AS\(\text{Dist}(AS\)   CANUAL CONDITIONS's (Quasiness)    With respect to your relationship to the doctor or clinician who performed the pulmonary function test check all applicable boxes: Sably to the foregoing objections, please refer to responses below.  If the test was performed by a doctor, was the doctor your personal physician?   Yes   \(\text{I}\)   Was the testing doctor und/or clinician paid for the services performed?   \(\text{Q}\)   Yes   \(\text{Q}\)   Yes, please indicate who paid for the services performed.   Claimant paid for the services through his/her counsel.  Did you retain counsel in order to receive any of the services performed by the testing doctor or clinician?   Yes   \(\text{Q}\)   Yes   \(\text{Dist}\)   Yes   Yes   \(\t	S	an Antonio			IX		7	8229		
With respect to your relationship to the doctor or clinician who performed the pulmonary function test check all applicable boxes: Subject to the foregoing objections, please refer to responses below.  If the test was performed by a doctor, was the doctor your personal physician?   Yes	С	ity			State/Province	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Ž	ip/Post	tal Co	ode
With respect to your relationship to the doctor or clinician who performed the pulmonary function test check all applicable boxes: Sabit to the foregoing objections, please refer to responses below.  If the test was performed by a doctor, was the doctor your personal physician?   Yes   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1	I	nterpreting Doctor's Day	time Telephone Num	ber:	(210)61	4-6378				
if the test was performed by a doctor, was the doctor your personal physician?   Yes   Yes			## ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) (	SHESSES SHEET SHE	D CONDITIONES (COM	pried)				
Was the testing doctor and/or clinician paid for the services he/she performed?	to	Vith respect to your relate the foregoing objections	ionship to the doctor , please refer to resp	or clinician who perf onses below.	formed the pulmonary fun	ction test check all ap	plical	ble box	res: S	Subje
	If	the test was performed by	a doctor, was the doct	or your personal physi	ician?	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		Yes	Ø	1
Did you retain counsel in order to receive any of the services performed by the testing doctor or clinician?  Pleases refer to the foregoing objections.  Was the testing doctor or clinician referred to you by counsel?  Claimant objects to this question since "referred to you" is vague and ambiguous; therefore, the question cannot be answered with either a "yes" or a "no." The doctor was retained by Claimant through Claimant's counsel to provide expert medical opinions in Claimant's Asbestos Lawsuit as needed to establish the elements of Claimant's claim under state law.  Are you aware of any relationship between either the doctor or clinician and your legal counsel?  Claimant objects to this question since "relationship" is vague and ambiguous; therefore, the question cannot be answered with either a "yes" or a "no." The doctor was retained by Claimant through Claimant's counse to provide expert medical opinions in Claimant's Asbestos Lawsuit as needed to establish the elements of Claimant's claim under state law.  Was the testing doctor certified as a pulmonologist or internist by the American Board of Internal Medicine at the time of the pulmonary function test?  Was the doctor your relationship to the doctor interpreting the results of the pulmonary function test check all applicable boxes:  Was the doctor paid for the services that he/she performed?  Was the doctor paid for the services that he/she performed?  Was the doctor paid for the services up of the services performed by the doctor? "Please refer to the foregoing objections.  Was the doctor referred to you by counsel?  Claimant objects to this question since "referred to you" is vague and ambiguous; therefore, the question cannot be answered with either a "yes" or a "no." The doctor was retained by Claimant's counsel to provide expert medical opinions in Claimant's Asbestos Lawsuit as needed to establish the elements of Claimant's counsel or provide expert medical opinions in Claimant's Asbestos Lawsuit as needed to establish the elements of Claimant	V	as the testing doctor and/c	or clinician paid for the	services he/she perfo	rmed?		×	Yes		I
Yes	If	yes, please indicate who p	aid for the services pe	rformed:	Claimant paid for the	services through his/her	coun	sel.		
Claimant objects to this question since "referred to you" is vague and ambiguous; therefore, the question cannot be answered with either a "yes" or a "no." The doctor was retained by Claimant through Claimant's counsel to provide expert medical opinions in Claimant's Asbestos Lawsuit as needed to establish the elements of Claimant's claim under state law.  Are you aware of any relationship between either the doctor or clinician and your legal counsel?  Claimant objects to this question since "relationship" is vague and ambiguous; therefore, the question cannot be answered with either a "yes" or a "no." The doctor was retained by Claimant through Claimant's counse to provide expert medical opinions in Claimant's Asbestos Lawsuit as needed to establish the elements of Claimant's claim under state law.  Was the testing doctor certified as a pulmonologist or internist by the American Board of Internal Medicine at the time of the pulmonary function test?  With respect to your relationship to the doctor interpreting the results of the pulmonary function test check all applicable boxes:  Was the doctor your personal physician?  Was the doctor paid for the services that he/she performed?  If yes, please indicate who paid for the services performed:  Claimant paid for the services through his/her counsel.  Did you retain counsel in order to receive any of the services performed by the doctor? "Please refer to the foregoing Yes No objections.  Was the doctor referred to you by counsel?  Claimant objects to this question since "referred to you" is vague and ambiguous; therefore, the question cannot be answered with either a "yes" or a "no." The doctor was retained by Claimant's counsel to provide expert medical opinions in Claimant's Asbestos Lawsuit as needed to establish the elements of Claimant through Claimannt's counsel to provide expert medical opinions in Claimant's Asbestos Lawsuit as needed to establish the elements of Claimant through Claimannt's counsel to provide expert medical opinions in Claimant's Asbestos	· D	id you retain counsel in ore Please refer to the forego	der to receive any of the ing objections.	e services performed	by the testing doctor or clin	ician?		Yes		N
Claimant objects to this question since "relationship" is vague and ambiguous; therefore, the question cannot be answered with either a "yes" or a "no." The doctor was retained by Claimant through Claimant's couns to provide expert medical opinions in Claimant's Asbestos Lawsuit as needed to establish the elements of Claimant's claim under state law.  Was the testing doctor certified as a pulmonologist or internist by the American Board of Internal Medicine at the time of the pulmonary function test?  With respect to your relationship to the doctor interpreting the results of the pulmonary function test check all applicable boxes:  Was the doctor your personal physician?  Was the doctor paid for the services that he/she performed?  If yes, please indicate who paid for the services performed?  Claimant paid for the services through his/her counsel.  Was the doctor referred to you by counsel?  Claimant objects to this question since "referred to you" is vague and ambiguous; therefore, the question cannot be answered with either a "yes" or a "no." The doctor was retained by Claimant's counsel to provide expert medical opinions in Claimant's Asbestos Lawsuit as needed to establish the elements of Claimant's claim under state law.  Claimant objects to this question since "relationship" is vague and ambiguous; therefore, the question cannot be answered with either a "yes" or a "no." The doctor was retained by Claimant through Claimant's counsel in Claimant's claim under state law.  Claimant objects to this question since "relationship" is vague and ambiguous; therefore, the question cannot be answered with either a "yes" or a "no." The doctor was retained by Claimant through Claimant's counsel in Claimant's claim under state law.  Claimant's claim under state law.  Was the doctor interpreting the pulmonary function test results were reviewed?  Yes   No	C ar p	laimant objects to this qu nswered with either a "ya rovide expert medical opi	uestion since "referre es" or a "no."  The de	ed to you" is vague an octor was retained by	nd ambiguous; therefore, t v Claimant through Claim	the question cannot be	. 🗆	Yes		I
be answered with either a "yes" or a "no." The doctor was retained by Claimant through Claimant's couns to provide expert medical opinions in Claimant's Asbestos Lawsuit as needed to establish the elements of Claimant's claim under state law.  Was the testing doctor certified as a pulmonologist or internist by the American Board of Internal Medicine at the time of the pulmonary function test?	A	re you aware of any relatio	nship between either t	he doctor or clinician	and your legal counsel?	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	. 🗆	Yes		۱ ۱
With respect to your relationship to the doctor interpreting the results of the pulmonary function test check all applicable boxes:  Was the doctor your personal physician?	If	yes, please explain:	be answered with e to provide expert n	ither a "yes" or a "n iedical opinions in Cl	io." The doctor was retain	ted by Claimant throu	gh Cl	laiman	it's co	uns
Was the doctor your personal physician?				• • • • • • •						
Was the doctor your personal physician?							Ø	Yes		N
Claimant paid for the services through his/her counsel.     Did you retain counsel in order to receive any of the services performed by the doctor? "Please refer to the foregoing   Yes   No objections.   Yes   No Claimant objects to this question since "referred to you" is vague and ambiguous; therefore, the question cannot be answered with either a "yes" or a "no." The doctor was retained by Claimant through Claimant's counsel to provide expert medical opinions in Claimant's Asbestos Lawsuit as needed to establish the elements of Claimant's claim under state law.   Yes   No	th	e time of the pulmonary	function test?	***************************************	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •				N
Claimant paid for the services through his/her counsel.     Did you retain counsel in order to receive any of the services performed by the doctor? "Please refer to the foregoing   Yes   No objections.   Yes   No Claimant objects to this question since "referred to you" is vague and ambiguous; therefore, the question cannot be answered with either a "yes" or a "no." The doctor was retained by Claimant through Claimant's counsel to provide expert medical opinions in Claimant's Asbestos Lawsuit as needed to establish the elements of Claimant's claim under state law.   Yes   No	th V	e time of the pulmonary /ith respect to your relati	function test?	interpreting the resu	lts of the pulmonary func	 tion test check all appli	icable	e boxes	s:	
Did you retain counsel in order to receive any of the services performed by the doctor? *Please refer to the foregoing	th W	te time of the pulmonary lith respect to your relatives as the doctor your persona	function test?  conship to the doctor in the doctor	interpreting the resu	lts of the pulmonary func	tion test check all appli	icable	e boxes Yes	s: ⊠	l N
Was the doctor referred to you by counsel?	th W W	te time of the pulmonary  ith respect to your relative  as the doctor your personal  as the doctor paid for the s	function test? ionship to the doctor is all physician? services that he/she per	interpreting the resul	lts of the pulmonary func	tion test check all appli	icable	e boxes Yes Yes	s: ⊠	1 1
Claimant objects to this question since "relationship" is vague and ambiguous; therefore, the question cannot be answered with either a "yes" or a "no." The doctor was retained by Claimant through Claimant's counse provide expert medical opinions in Claimant's Asbestos Lawsuit as needed to establish the elements of Claimant's claim under state law.  Was the doctor interpreting the pulmonary function test results certified as a pulmonologist or internist by the American Board of Internal Medicine at the time the test results were reviewed?	W W W If Di	te time of the pulmonary  Ith respect to your relative the doctor your personates the doctor paid for the serves, please indicate who paid you retain counsel in order	function test? ionship to the doctor is all physician? services that he/she per aid for the services per	interpreting the result formed?	lts of the pulmonary funct	tion test check all appli	icable	e boxes Yes Yes Sel.	s: Ø	N N
be answered with either a "yes" or a "no." The doctor was retained by Claimant through Claimant's counse provide expert medical opinions in Claimant's Asbestos Lawsuit as needed to establish the elements of Claimant's claim under state law.  Was the doctor interpreting the pulmonary function test results certified as a pulmonologist or internist by the American Board of Internal Medicine at the time the test results were reviewed?	WWW WW Iff Object of City and pr	te time of the pulmonary  Ith respect to your relative the doctor your personal  It is the doctor paid for the serves, please indicate who personal in ordinary  It is the doctor referred to your retain counsel in ordinary  It is the doctor referred to your meant objects to this quiswered with either a "yesovide expert medical opin	function test?  ionship to the doctor in the properties of the services that he/she per the services per the to receive any of the perturbation of the services?  ions by counsel?  estion since "referrer or a "no." The do	interpreting the result formed?	Claimant paid for the soy the doctor? *Please refe	tion test check all application test check all applications through his/her or to the foregoing the question cannot be ant's counsel to	icable	e boxes Yes Yes Sel. Yes	s: Ø	No No
American Board of Internal Medicine at the time the test results were reviewed?	War	It is time of the pulmonary with respect to your relatives the doctor your personal was the doctor paid for the same and you retain counsel in ordifications.  It is the doctor referred to you aimant objects to this quiswered with either a "yesovide expert medical opinaim under state law.	function test?  ionship to the doctor in the properties of the services per aid for the services per aid for the services and the properties of the pr	interpreting the result rformed? e services performed b d to you" is vague and ctor was retained by asbestos Lawsuit as n	Claimant paid for the so by the doctor? *Please referred ambiguous; therefore, the Claimant through Claimant	tion test check all application test check all applications through his/her or to the foregoing the question cannot be ant's counsel to ments of Claimant's	icable	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	s: ⊠	No No
	W W W W W CI an preclas	It is time of the pulmonary  Ith respect to your relation of the source of the doctor your personal is the doctor paid for the source of the s	function test?  ionship to the doctor in the provide expert medical physician?  services that he/she pervices that he/she pervices that he/she pervices pervices any of the services are to receive any of the provide since "referrers" or a "no." The donions in Claimant's Anship between the doctor of the conserved with eight provide expert medical physicians.	interpreting the result of the	Claimant paid for the so by the doctor? *Please referred ambiguous; therefore, the Claimant through Claimant	tion test check all application test check all application test through his/her or to the foregoing to the question cannot be ant's counsel to ments of Claimant's ambiguous; therefore ed by Claimant through the county of the c	icable	Yes Yes Sel. Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	s:	No No No
THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY WAS A PROPERTY WAS A PARTY OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PARTY OF THE PART	W W If Diobb W CI and precise Ar	It is the doctor your relative to your relative the doctor your personal was the doctor paid for the stages, please indicate who paid you retain counsel in ordifications.  The doctor referred to you aimant objects to this quisawered with either a "yestovide expert medical opinaim under state law.  The you aware of any relation yes, please explain	function test?  ionship to the doctor is inship to the doctor is all physician?  services that he/she pervices per ler to receive any of the services are inship to the services per a "no." The do nions in Claimant's A maship between the doctor claimant objects to be answered with eight provide expert medical claimant's claim ung the pulmonary functions in the control of the control	rformed?  rformed: e services performed by sbestos Lawsuit as not and your legal count this question since "ther a "yes" or a "not cal opinions in Claim der state law.	Claimant paid for the so by the doctor? "Please referenced ambiguous; therefore, the Claimant through Claima	tion test check all application test check all application test through his/her extra to the foregoing the question cannot be ant's counsel to ments of Claimant's dambiguous; therefore ed by Claimant througs needed to establish the internist by the	couns  couns  couns  couns  couns  couns  couns	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes  Yes  Yes	S: S:	No No No
	Wind Wind Mind Wind Mind Mind Mind Mind Mind Mind Mind M	the time of the pulmonary  ith respect to your relatives the doctor your personal  it is the doctor paid for the second of the s	function test?  ionship to the doctor in the provide expert medical for the services per ler to receive any of the services in the provide expert medical mant's A maship between the doctor of the provide expert medical mant's claim unity of the pulmonary function at Medicine at the times in constitution of the pulmonary function of the pulmonary fu	rformed?  rformed: e services performed be described by selection since "this question since "ther a "yes" or a "notical opinions in Claim der state law.  ction test results certical the results certical the selection test results certical the selection test results were the test results were results certical the selection test results were results certical the selection test results were results certical test results were results were results certical test results were results certical test results were results and results results were results were results were results and results results results were results resu	Claimant paid for the so by the doctor? "Please refer d ambiguous; therefore, the Claimant through Claimane deded to establish the element of the doctor was retain nant's Asbestos Lawsuit and the desired as a pulmonologist of the reviewed?	tion test check all application test check all application test through his/her extra the foregoing the question cannot be ant's counsel to ments of Claimant's diambiguous; therefore ed by Claimant through the country of the countr	couns	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes  Yes  Yes	S: S:	No No

# Case 01-01139-AMC Doc 13628-7 Filed 11/10/06 Page 13 of 44

Findings:		1			
Name of Doctor Issuing Report:			WR GRA	CE PI	Q 3
Doctor's Specialty:					
Doctor's Mailing Address:					
Address					
City	State/Province	Ż	ip/Posta	ıl Coc	ie
Doctor's Daytime Telephone Number:	•••••		·		
With respect to your relationship to the doctor issuing the pat					
Was the doctor your personal physician?		🛮	Yes		No
Was the doctor paid for the services that he/she performed?	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	🗆	Yes		No
If yes, please indicate who paid for the services performed:					
Did you retain counsel in order to receive any of the services perfe	ormed by the doctor?	🗆	Yes		N
Was the doctor referred to you by counsel?	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	🗖	Yes		N
The second resolution to you by boardings,,,,					
Are you aware of any relationship between the doctor and your leg		🛮	Yes		N
Are you aware of any relationship between the doctor and your leg	gal counsel?	🛚	Yes		N
Are you aware of any relationship between the doctor and your leg	gal counsel?	🛚	Yes		N
Are you aware of any relationship between the doctor and your leg  If yes, please explain:  Was the doctor certified as a pathologist by the American Boa	gal counsel?  ord of Pathology at the time of the diagnosis?		Yes Yes		
Are you aware of any relationship between the doctor and your leg  If yes, please explain:  Was the doctor certified as a pathologist by the American Boa	gal counsel?				No
Are you aware of any relationship between the doctor and your leg  If yes, please explain:  Was the doctor certified as a pathologist by the American Boa  PARCELL AND LAYERS AND  With respect to the condition alleged, have you received medic	gal counsel?  ord of Pathology at the time of the diagnosis?		Yes		No
Are you aware of any relationship between the doctor and your leg  If yes, please explain:  Was the doctor certified as a pathologist by the American Boa  PARCELL AND LAYERSHIP  With respect to the condition alleged, have you received medicobjections.	gal counsel?  ord of Pathology at the time of the diagnosis?  LECTED CONSTITUTION(S):(Continue)  cal treatment from a doctor for the condition? I	□ Please refer	Yes to the fe	□ orego	No
Are you aware of any relationship between the doctor and your leg  If yes, please explain:  Was the doctor certified as a pathologist by the American Boa  PARCELL ASSESSIONER  With respect to the condition alleged, have you received medicobjections.	gal counsel?  ord of Pathology at the time of the diagnosis?  LECTED CONSTITUTION(S):(Continue)  cal treatment from a doctor for the condition? I		Yes		No
Are you aware of any relationship between the doctor and your leg  If yes, please explain:  Was the doctor certified as a pathologist by the American Boa  Wiff H. ASSISTICENT  With respect to the condition alleged, have you received medicobjections.  If yes, please complete the following:	gal counsel?  ord of Pathology at the time of the diagnosis?  LECTED CONSTITUTION(S):(Continue)  cal treatment from a doctor for the condition? I	□ Please refer	Yes to the fe	□ orego	No
Are you aware of any relationship between the doctor and your leg  If yes, please explain:  Was the doctor certified as a pathologist by the American Boa  PARCELLA ASSESSED.  With respect to the condition alleged, have you received medicobjections.  If yes, please complete the following:  Name of Treating Doctor:	gal counsel?  ord of Pathology at the time of the diagnosis?  LECTED CONSTITUTION(S):(Continue)  cal treatment from a doctor for the condition? I	□ Please refer	Yes to the fe	□ orego	No
Are you aware of any relationship between the doctor and your leg  If yes, please explain:  Was the doctor certified as a pathologist by the American Boa  With respect to the condition alleged, have you received medicobjections.  If yes, please complete the following:  Name of Treating Doctor:  Treating Doctor's Specialty:	gal counsel?  ord of Pathology at the time of the diagnosis?  LECTED CONSTITUTION(S):(Continue)  cal treatment from a doctor for the condition? I	□ Please refer	Yes to the fe	□ orego	No
Are you aware of any relationship between the doctor and your leg  If yes, please explain:  Was the doctor certified as a pathologist by the American Boa  PARCELLA ASSESSED.  With respect to the condition alleged, have you received medicobjections.  If yes, please complete the following:  Name of Treating Doctor:	gal counsel?  ord of Pathology at the time of the diagnosis?  LECTED CONSTITUTION(S):(Continue)  cal treatment from a doctor for the condition? I	□ Please refer	Yes to the fe	□ orego	No
Are you aware of any relationship between the doctor and your leg  If yes, please explain:  Was the doctor certified as a pathologist by the American Boa  With respect to the condition alleged, have you received medicobjections.  If yes, please complete the following:  Name of Treating Doctor:  Treating Doctor's Specialty:  Treating Doctor's Mailing Address:	gal counsel?  ord of Pathology at the time of the diagnosis?  Extra Counsel  cal treatment from a doctor for the condition? I	Please refer	Yes to the fo	Drego	No ing N
Are you aware of any relationship between the doctor and your leg  If yes, please explain:  Was the doctor certified as a pathologist by the American Boa  PARTIE SPECIAL NA  With respect to the condition alleged, have you received medic objections.  If yes, please complete the following:  Name of Treating Doctor:  Treating Doctor's Specialty:  Treating Doctor's Mailing Address:  Address  City	gal counsel?  ord of Pathology at the time of the diagnosis?  EXTER CONTINUOUS (STREETHING)  cal treatment from a doctor for the condition? I	Please refer	Yes to the fe	Drego	No ing N
Are you aware of any relationship between the doctor and your leg  If yes, please explain:  Was the doctor certified as a pathologist by the American Boa  With respect to the condition alleged, have you received medicobjections.  If yes, please complete the following:  Name of Treating Doctor:  Treating Doctor's Specialty:  Treating Doctor's Mailing Address:  Address	gal counsel?  ord of Pathology at the time of the diagnosis?  EATER CONSESSION(S) (Continue)  cal treatment from a doctor for the condition? I	Please refer	Yes to the fo	Drego	No ing N

[REMAINDER OF PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK]

		•									]						i
HE DERK THE STRUKETO GRACE ASPESTON CONTAINS PRODUCTS.	ege exposure to Grace asbestos-containing products. If you allege exposure at multiple sites, the Court has ordered that you must, additional copies of Part III are attached as Appendix D to this Questionnaire.	list of occupation and industry codes in the Instructions to Part III to indicate your occupation and the industry in which you worked.	nding to whether you were any of the following during your exposure:	<ul> <li>(d) A worker at a site where Grace asbestos-containing products were being installed, mixed,</li> <li>removed or cut by others</li> </ul>	(e) A worker in a space where Grace asbestos-containing products were being installed, mixed, removed or cut by others	(f) If other, please specify	se refer to the attached WHS, interrogatory responses, Statement of Earnings and/or depositions, if applicable	Location:		Unions of which you were a member during your employment:	Poundation institutes When should be not the secretary in or secretary in or secretary in or secretary in the secretary in th						
PARTIII DURK THESTHOSIRE	Pease complete the chart below for each site at which you allege exposure to Grace asbestos complete a separate chart for each site. For your convenience, additional copies of Part III ar	f exposure was in connection with your employment, use the list of occupation and industry	n the "Nature of Exposure" column, for each job listed, please indicate the letter(s) corresponding to whether you were any of the following during your exposure:	(a) A worker who personally mixed Grace asbestos-containing products	(b) A worker who personally removed or cut Grace asbestos-containing products	(c) A worker who personally installed Grace asbestos-containing products	ite of Exposure: Subject to the foregoing objections, please refer to the attached WHS	Site Name:	Site Type:   Residence   Business Site Owner:	Employer During Exposure:	Products Identification of East Constitution of East Constitution of East Constitution of East Constitution of	ob 1 Description:	ob 2 Description:	ob 3 Description:	ob 4 Description:	ob 5 Description:	ob 6 Description:

<del></del>	
Manna Manna	
1.	Are you asserting an injury caused by exposure to Grace asbestos-containing products through contact/proximity with another injured person? Subject to the foregoing objections, please refer to attached WHS, interrogatory  responses and deposition, if applicable.
	If yes, complete questions 2 through 10 of this section for each injured person through which you allege exposure to Grace asbestos-containing products. For your convenience, additional copies of Part IV are attached as Appendix E to this Questionnaire.
2.	Please indicate the following information regarding the other injured person: Subject to the foregoing objections, please refer to the attached WHS, interrogatory responses and deposition, if applicable.
	Name of Other Injured Person: Gender:  Male  Female
	Last Four Digits of Social Security Number: Birth Date://
3.	What is your Relationship to Other Injured Person: Subject to the foregoing objections,  Description Spouse Child Description Other please refer to attached WHS, interrogatory responses and deposition, if applicable.
4.	Nature of Other Injured Person's Exposure to Grace Asbestos-Containing Products:
	Subject to the foregoing objections, please refer to attached WHS, interrogatory responses and deposition, if applicable.
5.	Dates Other Injured Person was Exposed to Grace Asbestos-Containing Products: Subject to the foregoing objections, please refer to attached WHS, interrogatory responses and deposition, if applicable.
	From: To:
6.	Other Injured Person's Basis for Identification of Asbestos-Containing Product as Grace Product:
	Subject to the foregoing objections, please refer to attached WHS, interrogatory responses and deposition, if applicable.
7.	Has the Other Injured Person filed a lawsuit related to his/her exposure? Subject to the foregoing objections, please
	If yes, please provide caption, case number, file date, and court name for the lawsuit:
	Caption:
	Case Number: File Date:
	Court Name:
8.	Nature of Your Own Exposure to Grace Asbestos-Containing Product:
-	Subject to the foregoing objections, please refer to attached WHS, interrogatory responses and deposition, if applicable.
9.	Dates of Your Own Exposure to Grace Asbestos-Containing Product: Subject to the foregoing objections, please refer to attached WHS, interrogatory responses and deposition, if applicable.
	From:/

[REMAINDER OF PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK]

Subject to the foregoing objections, please refer to attached WHS, interrogatory responses and deposition, if applicable.

10. Your Basis for Identification of Asbestos-Containing Product as Grace Product:

# Parte V. Exden Rato Komerras as esbes energente

Please complete the chart below for each party against which you have filed a lawsuit and/or claim alleging exposure to asbestos-containing products other than Grace products. If you filed such lawsuits and/or claims against multiple parties, the Court has ordered that you must complete a separate chart for each party. For your convenience, additional copies of Part V are attached as Appendix F to this Questionnaire.

If exposure was in connection with your employment, use the list of occupation and industry codes in the Instructions to Part III to indicate your occupation and the industry in which you worked. In the "Nature of Exposure" column, for each product listed, please indicate the letter(s) corresponding to whether you were any of the following during your exposure:

- (a) A worker who personally mixed Non-Grace asbestos-containing products
- (b) A worker who personally removed or cut Non-Grace asbestos-containing products
- (c) A worker who personally installed Non-Grace asbestos-containing products

(d) A

 (e) A worker in a space where Non-Grace asbestos-containing products were being installed, mixed, removed or cut by others

(f) If other, please specify,

Size Attached List of Parties Assumer Which Lawrent or Chain Was Fleed.   Parties for the Chain Was Fleed.   Parties fo	Party Against which Lawsuit or Claim was Filed:	-	Occupation Indiana Weignstrate restriction	
100 2 Description:   100 2 Description:   100 2 Description:   100 2 Description:   100 3 D	See Attached List of Parties Against V Claim Was Filed.	-	Leit.  Leiter (1977) - reculation and being decreased to the decreased of the control of the con	
10   10   10   10   10   10   10   10	Subject to the forest since objections		1. J. M. 175 C. L.	
Job 1 Description:   Job 2 Description:   Job 2 Description:   Job 2 Description:   Job 3 Description:   Job 4 Description:   Job 4 Description:   Job 5 Description:   Job 5 Description:   Job 6 Description:   Job 7 Description:   Job 7 Description:   Job 7 Description:   Job 7 Description:   Job 8 Description:   Job 9 D	Subject to the foregoing objections,	ior exposure intormation, see attac	ned Wils, interrogatory responses, co-worker work instory specis and deposition, if applicable.	
Job 2 Description:   Job 3 Description:   Job 3 Description:   Job 4 Description:   Job 5 Description:   Job 5 Description:   Job 5 Description:   Job 6 Description:   Job 6 Description:   Job 6 Description:   Job 6 Description:   Job 7 Description:   Job 6 Description:   Job 7 Description:   Job 7 Description:   Job 7 Description:   Job 7 Description:   Job 8 Description:   Job 9 D	Site of Exposure 1	Job 1 Description:		
10b 2 Description:   10b 3 Description:   10b 1 Description:   10b 1 Description:   10b 2 Description:   10b 3 Description:   10b 1 Description:   10b 1 Description:   10b 2 Description:   10b 2 Description:   10b 3 Description:   10b 4 Description:   10b 5 D	Site Name:			
ter	Address:	Job 2 Description:		
Job 3 Description:   Job 1 Description:     Job 2 Description:     Job 2 Description:     Job 3 Description:     Job 2 Description:     Job 2 Description:     Job 3 Description:     Job 3 Description:     Job 3 Description:       Job 3 Description:	City and State:			<del></del>
Job 1 Description:   Job 2 Description:   Job 2 Description:   Job 3 Description:   Job 2 Description:   Job 2 Description:   Job 2 Description:   Job 2 Description:   Job 3 D	Site Owner:	Job 3 Description:		
soure 2         Job 1 Description:         Iob 2 Description:         Iob 3 Description:         Iob 4 Description:         Iob 5 Description:				
Job 2 Description:   Job 3 D	Site of Exposure 2	Job I Description:		
Tob 2 Description:   Tob 3 Description:   Tob 3 Description:   Tob 4 Description:   Tob 5 Description:   Tob 6 Description:   Tob 6 Description:   Tob 7 Description:   Tob 7 Description:   Tob 6 Description:   Tob 7 Description:   Tob 8 Description:   Tob 9 D	Site Name:			
sure 3  Job 3 Description:  Job 2 Description:  Job 3 Description:  Job 3 Description:	Address:	Job 2 Description:		
Iob 3 Description:         Job 1 Description:         Iob 2 Description:         Iob 3 D	City and State:			
Soure 3  Job 1 Description:  Job 2 Description:  Job 3 Description:	Site Owner:	Job 3 Description:		
Job 1 Description:   Job 2 Description:   Job 3 D				
te: Job 2 Description: Job 3 Description:	Site of Exposure 3	Job 1 Description:		
te: Job 2 Description:	Site Name:			
Job 3 Description:	Address:	Job 2 Description:		
Job 3 Description:	City and State:			
/R G	Site Owner.	Job 3 Description:	·	[ w
		•	K	R G

Ξ

316316	PART VE DARRE	NAMENT THE PORT	
Other than jobs listed in Part III or V, pleas For each job, include your employer, locat use the copy of Part VI attached as Apper attached Itemized Statement of Earnin	ion of employment, and dates of empl idix G to this Ouestionnaire if additi	oyment. Only include jobs at which y	on worked for at leasenment reasen
Occupation Code:	If Code 59, specify:	•	
Industry Code:	If Code 118, specify:		
Employer:			
Beginning of Employment:	//	End of Employment:	/
Location: Address			
City		State/Province	Zip/Postal Code
Occupation Code:	If Code 59, specify:		
	If Code 118, specify:		-
Employer:		<del> </del>	
Beginning of Employment:		End of Employment:	
Location:		and or with to future.	
Address			
City		State/Province	Zip/Postal Code
Occupation Code:	If Code 59, specify:		
Industry Code:	If Code 118, specify:	<del></del>	
Employer:			
Beginning of Employment:		End of Employment:	
Location:		- 7	
Address			
City		State/Province	Zip/Postal Code
٤			
	If Code 59, specify:		
	If Code 118, specify:		
Employer:			<del></del>
•	_//	End of Employment:	//
Location: Address			
" AND WALL			
City		State/Province	Zip/Postal Code

# REDACTED

# PART VII. LITIGATION AND CLAPMS REGARDING ASDESTOS AND FOR SILICS.

,	WE CHACE	DIG	35027.004

a.	LITIGATION Subject to the foregoing objections, please refer to Claimant's responses below. Claimant's responses are limited to the asbestos-related lawsuit where Debtor was sued.
1.	Have you ever been a plaintiff in a lawsuit regarding asbestos or silica?
	If yes, please complete the rest of this Part VII(a) for each lawsuit. For your convenience, additional copies of Part VII are attached as Appendix G to this Questionnaire.
2.	Please provide the caption, case number, file date, and court name for the lawsuit you filed:
	Caption:
	Case Number: 01-00486-G File Date: 01/19/2001
	Court Name: 134TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
3.	Was Grace a defendant in the lawsuit?
4.	Was the lawsuit dismissed against any defendant? Subject to the foregoing objections, see attached I Yes I No List of Parties, if applicable.
	If yes, please provide the basis for dismissal of the lawsuit against each defendant:
	Please refer to foregoing objections.
5.	Has a judgment or verdict been entered? Subject to the foregoing objections, see attached List of Yes No Parties, if applicable.
	If yes, please indicate verdict amount for each defendant(s):  Please refer to the foregoing objections.
6.	Was a settlement agreement reached in this lawsuit? Subject to the foregoing objections, please see  Yes  No attached List of Parties, if applicable.
	If yes and the settlement was reached on or after April 2, 2001, please indicate the following:
	a. Settlement amount for each defendant: Please refer to the foregoing objections.
	b. Applicable defendants: Subject to the foregoing objections, please see attached List of Parties, if applicable.
	c. Disease or condition alleged:  Subject to the foregoing objections, please see attached List of Parties, if applicable.
	d. Disease or condition settled (if different than disease or condition alleged): Subject to the foregoing objections, please see attached List of Parties, if applicable.
7.	Were you deposed in this lawsuit?
	If yes and Grace was not a party in the lawsuit, please attach a copy of your deposition to this Questionnaire.
b.	CLAIMS Subject to the foregoing objections, please refer to Claimant's responses below. Claimant's responses are limited to asbestos-related personal injury claims.
i.	Have you ever asserted a claim regarding asbestos and/or silica, including but not limited to a claim against an
	asbestos trust (other than a formal lawsuit in court)?
	If yes, please complete the rest of this Part VII(b). If no, please skip to Part VIII.
2.	Date the claim was submitted: Subject to the foregoing objections, please see//
3.	Person or entity against whom the claim was submitted:  Subject to the foregoing objections, please see attached List of Parties, if applicable.
i.	Description of claim: Subject to the foregoing objections, please see attached List of Parties, if applicable.
5.	Was claim settled? Subject to the foregoing objections, please see attached List of Parties, if applicable.
5.	Please indicate settlement amount: Please refer to the foregoing objections.
7.	Was the claim dismissed or otherwise disallowed or not honored? Subject to the foregoing objections,   Yes  No please see attached List of Parties, if applicable.
	If yes, provide the basis for dismissal of the claim: Please refer to the foregoing objections.

Gender: Male  Birth Date:  Yes Other If other, please specify  State/Province Zip/Posta
Other If other, please specify  State/Province Zip/Posta
Other If other, please specify  State/Province Zip/Posta
Other If other, please specify  State/Province Zip/Posta
State/Province Zip/Posta
POP UMEN LATEOU
POP UMEN LATEOU
XEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
YOF UMBEN LATEON
mitting with this form.
7 . V
X-rays
1 X-ray reports/interpretations
] . CT scans
CT scan reports/interpretations Depositions from lawsuits indicated in Part VII
of this Questionnaire
Death Certification
Supporting documentation of other asbestos expos
] X-rays
X-ray reports/interpretations
CT scans
CT Scan reports/interpretations Death Certification

I swear, <u>under penalty of perjury</u>, that, to the best of my knowledge, all of the foregoing information contained in the Questionnaire is true, accurate and complete.

Signature: DECEASED Date: / /
Please Print Name:

# TO BE COMPLETED BY THE LEGAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE INJURED PERSON.

I swear that, to the best of	mv knowledge, all of the inform	ation contained in this Ques	stionnaire i	s true, accurate and complete.
Signature:	REDACTED		Date:	1210512005
Please Print Name	REDACTED			

**********	
200022333	
********	
>****	
********	
200	
*******	
SOUTH WALLS	
MAN 22 (20)	
374366660	
******	
SSERVE STATE OF THE PARTY OF TH	
*******	
*********	
SHOW HE WAY	
ASSESSED.	
KANDERS J.	
on with the first	
SPENDERS !	
entro esta	
CONTRACTOR OF THE PROPERTY OF	
93.ANZ ANZ	
COLUMN TO SERVICE AND ADDRESS OF THE PARTY O	
WWW.	
Control of the Control	
24450 D.A	
G 14 (1) (1) (1)	
2. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.	
100115-000	
11 X	
11. S	
enstanding Parton a larkand	
AND VIEW AND	
THE STREET	
ACARAT WINE WATER	
ACAINSTAIGH BEA BAGGA SEA	
A CALINET WHITE HE	
SACARST VIHERT	
SACATIST VINEE THE	
ES ACAINST MISTERIER PARTY IS A 148	
HES ACATOS TABLED TO PAGE VII A. MA	
HES ACAINST WHICH I	
THE SECTION OF SHIP	
THE SACATOST WHITH THE	
THE SACATIST WHITHER BY	
HIL A BA BAYA Tiddhia daya	
ARTHUR ACAINST URBERTARY	
PASTILIS ACADIST VIHER IN	
Parthy acards whiteer Parthy with the	
Parties acards Viffering	
e parties acainst vider of Parties	
H PARTIES AGAINST WHIELE. PARE Y II Y III	
HEPATHA ACAMSEVAHA PATA TAMBA	
Me o ilo ino Thomas acardos en editor de	
THE PASTIES AGAINST WHITELE PAST Y IX	
I OF PASTIES ACADMST VIHALIT. PASTATA A	
A THE PARTIES AGAINST WHEELTAN STIP ON STAIN WAS FILED PARTAIL A HIRANION	

:

į

Subject to the foregoing objections, please refer to the responses below for a list of each Party against which a lawsuit or claim was filed as requested in Part V of the Overtionnaire and for information resonative to Part VII of the Overtionnaire

Questionnaire and 10f information responsive to Fart VII of the Questionnaire,	stionnaire.		
DEFENDANT	DEFENDANT STATUS (Question VII a. 4-6)	DISEASE OR CONDITION ALLEGED	DISEASE OR CONDITION SETTLED
A. P. Green Industries, Inc.	UNRESOLVED		
A. P. Green Services, Inc.	UNRESOLVED		
A.C. and S., Inc.	UNRESOLVED		
Ametek, Inc.	SETTLED	rc	CC
Aqua-Chem., Inc.	SETTLED .	IC	rc
AstenJohnson, Inc.	SETTLED	TC	רכ
Building Materials Corporation of America	UNRESOLVED		
Certainteed Corporation	SELTLED	LC	LC
Champlain Cable Corporation	SETTLED	ıc	rc
Crown Cork & Seal Company, Inc.	DISMISSED		
Dow Chemical Company, successor by merger to Union Carbide Corp.	DISMISSED		
Dresser Industries, Inc., successor-by-merger to Brown & Root	SELTLED	ıc	CC
FEDERAL MOGUL CORPORATION	UNRESOLVED		
Federal Mogul Global Growth, Ltd.	UNRESOLVED		
FLINTKOTE	SETTLED	LC	LC
Foster Wheeler North America Corporation fka Foster Wheeler Energy	SETTLED	רכ	rc
G-I Holdings, Inc.	UNRESOLVED		
GAF Corporation	UNRESOLVED		
General Refractories Company	UNRESOLVED		
Georgia-Pacific Corporation	SETILED	TC	LC
Harbison-Walker Refractories	SETTLED	LC	rc
INDRESCÓ INC.	SETTLED	LC	DT.
J. T. THORPE CO.	SETTLED	TC	rc
Kellogg, Brown & Root, Inc., successor-by-merger to Brown & Root, Inc.	SETTLED	רכ	TC
Kelly-Moore Paint Company	SETTLED	ΣT	TC
Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, Inc.	SETTLED	27	TC C
National Gypsum Company	UNRESOLVED		
North American Refractories	SETTLED	LC	rc
Owens-Illinois, Inc.	UNRESOLVED		



;

-----

Proko Industries, Inc.	SETTLED	IC	rc
Quigley Company, Inc.	SETTLED	rc	TC
Rapid American Corporation	DISMISSED		
Riley Power, Inc. (f/k/a Babcock Borsig Power, Inc.)	SETTLED .	TC	rc
Synkoloid	UNRESOLVED		
TURNER & NEWELL	UNRESOLVED		
Turner & Newell Industries, Inc.	UNRESOLVED		
Turner & Newell, Ltd.	UNRESOLVED		
U. S. Mineral Products Co.	UNRESOLVED		management of the control of the con
Union Carbide Corporation	SETTLED	10	TC
Unitoyal Holdings, Inc.	DISMISSED		
United States Gypsum Company	UNRESOLVED		
W. R. Grace & Co.	UNRESOLVED		
Zurn Industries, Inc.	SETTLED	ıc	LC

Proko Industries, Inc.







	EIST OF PARTIES ACAUSTINE	eds of partical resultantical aware or chart was deed.  Tarener of same	
DATE CLAIM WAS SUBMITTED	ENTITY AGAINST WHOM CLAIM WAS SUBMITTED	DESCRIPTION OF CLAIM	CLAIM STATUS
5/16/2003	3M Company, Ek/a Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Company, alk/a 3M	ASBESTOS - PERSONAL INJURY	SETTLED
7/10/2001	Babcock & Wilcox Company	ASBESTOS - PERSONAL INJURY	UNRESOLVED
1/8/2003	CELOTEX CORPORATION	ASBESTOS - PERSONAL INJURY	UNRESOLVED
5/28/2002	Combustion Engineering Inc.	ASBESTOS - PERSONAL INJURY	SETTLED
	Eagle Picher Industries, Inc.	ASBESTOS - PERSONAL INJURY	SETTLED
6/28/2002	Garlock, Inc.	ASBESTOS - PERSONAL INJURY	SETTLED
4/30/2003	General Electric Company	ASBESTOS - PERSONAL INJURY	SETTLED
6/29/2001	H. K. PORTER	ASBESTOS - PERSONAL INJURY	SETTLED
3/17/2003	Halliburton Entities	ASBESTOS - PERSONAL INDRY	SETTLED
2/18/2002	Rockwool Mfg., Co.	ASBESTOS - PERSONAL INJURY	UNRESOLVED
1/8/2003	Unarco Industries, Inc.	ASBESTOS - PERSONAL INJURY	SETTLED
4/21/2005	WESTERN MACARTHUR	ASBESTOS - PERSONAL INJURY	UNRESOLVED



# IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

In re:	}	Chapter 11
	}	
W.R. GRACE & CO., et al	}	Case No. 01-1139(JKF)
	}	(Jointly Administered)
Debtors.	}	,

# CLAIMANT'S OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO THE W.R. GRACE ASBESTOS PERSONAL INJURY OUESTIONNAIRE

Claimant<sup>1</sup> , by and through his counsel, Baron & Budd, P.C., submits the following objections and responses to the "W.R. Grace Asbestos Personal Injury Questionnaire" ("Questionnaire"). In order to maintain the integrity of the formatting on Debtor's Questionnaire, Claimant has set out all of his/her general and specific objections in the following separate sections of this response and hereby incorporates each of these objections into Claimant's Questionnaire responses by reference herein.

# CLAIMANT'S GENERAL OBJECTIONS TO THE W.R. GRACE ASBESTOS PERSONAL INJURY QUESTIONNAIRE

Claimant hereby files these objections in response to the Questionnaire propounded by W.R. Grace.

- Claimant objects to the Questionnaire and its Instructions to the extent that they impose discovery 1. obligations beyond those of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure and/or the rules of civil procedure in the state where Claimant filed an asbestos personal injury lawsuit. Claimant will respond to the discovery Questionnaire in accordance with those rules. Claimant objects to the Instructions as they make document requests that are overly broad, harassing, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Claimant contends that the burden and expense of responding to Debtor's Questionnaire in the format requested by Debtor outweighs its likely benefit.
- 2. Claimant objects to the Questionnaire and its Instructions to the extent that they seek information or identification of documents that are attorney work product, subject to the attorney-client or consulting expert privileges, or are otherwise not discoverable under the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure or the rules of civil procedure in the state where Claimant filed an asbestos personal injury lawsuit. Claimant further objects to the Questionnaire and its Instructions to the extent it seeks disclosure of facts known or opinions held by any expert who has been retained or specially employed in anticipation of litigation or

Throughout these Objections and Responses, the "Claimant" means the person identified in the Questionnaire Part I. Subsection a. whether living or deceased, who has or had an alleged asbestos-related disease and who filed an asbestos-related lawsuit either directly or through his/her Estate.



preparation for trial and who is not expected to be called as a witness at trial. Inadvertent disclosure of any such information or documents shall not constitute waiver of any privilege.

- 3. By providing responses to the Questionnaire, the claimant does not concede that the information provided is discoverable, relevant, or admissible. All responses are provided subject to the objections set forth herein. Each claimant reserves the right to challenge further discovery into the subject matter of the Questionnaire.
- 4. Claimant objects to any request in the Questionnaire that seeks any information that is not in the Claimant's control, custody, or possession; is already in the control, custody or possession of the Debtor; or is obtainable with equal or greater facility by the Debtor. The answers to the majority of the questions in Debtor's Questionnaire may be derived or ascertained from interrogatory responses and documents produced in connection with Claimant's asbestos personal injury lawsuit to which Debtor was a party prior to filing for bankruptcy ("Claimant's Asbestos Lawsuit"). Because the burden of deriving or ascertaining the answer is substantially the same for Debtor as for Claimant, Claimant has specified in Claimant's Questionnaire response the document from which the answer may be derived as permitted by Rule 33(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure as incorporated by Rule 7033 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure.
- 5. In response to this Questionnaire, Claimant objects to the extent that the questions are vague, ambiguous and premature. Moreover, Claimant objects to this Questionnaire to the extent that the scope and content of the information sought is unreasonably cumulative and duplicative.
- 6. Claimant objects to this Questionnaire to the extent it requires Claimant to compile documents or information from sources not presently available to Claimants, including documents created or compiled by third parties. Claimant objects to the Questionnaire to the extent it purports to require Claimant to gather and summarize information contained in voluminous papers that are already matters of public record.
- 7. Claimant objects to this Questionnaire to the extent that the questions and their discreet sub-parts exceed twenty-five (25) in number.
- 8. By submitting this response to the Questionnaire, Claimant does not intend to, and hereby does not, submit to the jurisdiction of the United States District Court for the District of Delaware, to the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware, or to any other court. Claimant reserves (i) all objections to jurisdiction and/or venue, (ii) all protections afforded under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 45 and Federal Bankruptcy Rule of Procedure 9016, and (iii) the right to jury trial afforded under 28 U.S.C. § 157(b)(5).



# CLAIMANT'S SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS TO THE W.R. GRACE ASBESTOS PERSONAL INJURY QUESTIONNAIRE

### INSTRUCTIONS

- 1. Claimant objects to Instruction A.1 to the extent that it purports to include claims under contract, warranty, guarantee, contribution, joint and several liability, subrogation, reimbursement or indemnity on the ground that it is overly broad and requests information that is not relevant to the subject matter of the estimation proceeding.
- 2. Claimant objects to Instruction C in its entirety and Instruction J regarding medical supporting documentation on the ground that it is vague, ambiguous and exceeds the scope of discovery in that it seeks information and documents from experts that is not discoverable and is subject to the work product and consulting expert privileges. Claimant further objects to the portion of the instruction requiring claimant to "complete a separate Part II for each initial diagnosis and any previous or subsequent diagnosis or diagnostic tests that change or conflict with the initial diagnosis", on the ground that the burden outweighs its likely benefit. Claimant further objects to the instruction to attach all x-ray readings and reports and all pulmonary function test ("PFT") results on the ground that it is overly broad and ambiguous. Claimant further objects to the Discovery Questionnaire to the extent that it seeks disclosure of facts known or opinions held by any expert who has been retained or specially employed in anticipation of litigation or preparation for trial and who is not expected to be called as a witness at trial. Without limiting the foregoing, Claimant objects to the following provisions of the Discovery Questionnaire as violative of Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(4)(B):
  - (a). Claimant objects to Section C of the Instructions to the extent that it requests the completion of Part II of the Discovery Questionnaire "if you received diagnoses and diagnostic tests relating to the same condition by multiple doctors."
  - (b). Claimant objects to Section C of the Instructions to the extent that it requests the production of "any and all documents" that "support or conflict with your diagnosis."
  - (c). Claimant objects to Section C of the Instructions to the extent that it requests the production of "all x-ray readings and reports."
  - (d). Claimant objects to Section C of the Instructions to the extent that it requests the production of "all pulmonary function test results, including the raw data and all spirometric tracings, on which the results are based."
  - (e). Claimant objects to Section J of the Instructions to the extent that it requests the production of "any and all documents" that "support or conflict with your diagnosis."
  - (f). Claimant objects to Part II of the Discovery Questionnaire to the extent that it requests disclosure of "diagnoses and diagnostic tests" by "multiple doctors" concerning "previous or subsequent diagnoses or diagnostic tests that change or conflict with the original



diagnoses." Claimant urges this objection with regard to all "conditions" for which disclosure is requested.

Subject to the foregoing, Claimant will attach any x-rays, B-reads, pulmonary function tests or pathology reports considered by Claimant's medical expert in forming his/her opinion in connection with Claimant's Asbestos Lawsuit.

3. Claimant objects to Instruction D to the extent that it requests Claimant to "attach copies of any and all documents establishing that exposure to Grace asbestos-containing products had a substantial causal role in the development of the disease" on the ground that it is ambiguous and exceeds the scope of discovery in that it requests documents that are subject to the work product privilege. Further, Claimant has been barred by the Bankruptcy Code Section 362 stay from pursuing discovery against Debtors.

# PART I: IDENTITY OF INJURED PERSONS AND LEGAL COUNSEL

# Subsection (a)(7) - Daytime Telephone Number of client

Claimant objects to this inquiry on the ground that it is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Claimant is represented by counsel, as reflected herein, and may only be contacted through counsel.

# PART II: ASBESTOS-RELATED CONDITION(S)

1. General Objections. Claimant objects to Part II of the Questionnaire in its entirety on the ground that it exceeds the scope of discovery in that it seeks information not relevant to the estimation proceeding, information that is privileged, and information from experts that is non-discoverable and is subject to the consulting expert and work product privileges. Additionally, the information sought may be derived from the Claimant's discoverable medical records, which are attached to the Questionnaire. Claimant further objects on the ground that the information requested by this question and its sub-parts is equally available to the Debtor in that it may be derived from Claimant's discoverable medical reports attached to the Questionnaire. Claimant further objects to the Discovery Questionnaire to the extent that it seeks disclosure of any privileged communication between Claimant, and/or a representative of Claimant, and any attorney for Claimant, and/or a representative of any attorney for Claimant. In addition, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(b)(3), Claimant objects to the Discovery Questionnaire to the extent that it seeks disclosure of the work product of any attorney for Claimant, including but not limited to the mental impressions, conclusions, opinions or legal theories of any attorney or other representative of Claimant.



- 2. Subsection 1(a)-(f) Condition Being Alleged. Claimant objects to this question and each of its subparts (a-f) on the ground that it exceeds the scope of discovery in that it seeks information not relevant to the estimation proceeding, and information from experts that is non-discoverable and is subject to the consulting expert and work product privileges. Claimant further objects on the ground that the information requested by this question and its sub-parts is equally available to the Debtor in that it may be derived from the claimant's discoverable medical reports attached to the Questionnaire. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing, please see Claimant's Questionnaire responses and the documents attached hereto.
- 3. Subsection 2 Information Regarding Diagnosis.
  - a. Claimant objects to Part II, Subsection 2 on the ground that it exceeds the scope of discovery in that it seeks information that is not relevant to the subject matter of the estimation proceeding, seeks information from experts that is non-discoverable, and seeks information that is subject to the consulting expert, work product and attorneyclient privileges. Claimant further objects to this question as it is not reasonable and necessary to this proceeding and is harassing. Claimant further objects to this question to the extent that it purports to require Claimant to gather and summarize information already contained in documents provided with Claimant's Questionnaire answers, and is, therefore, obtainable with equal or greater facility by the Debtors. Claimant's diagnosis of an asbestos-related condition may be based on one or more diagnostic test(s), pathology report(s) or physical examination(s). Therefore, asking Claimant to state a "date of diagnosis" is vague and ambiguous. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing, in response to Part II, Subsection 2, Claimant has provided the date of the medical report prepared by the medical doctor designated by Claimant in Claimant's Asbestos Lawsuit to provide expert medical opinions regarding Claimant's asbestosrelated disease as needed to establish the elements of Claimant's claim under state law and has answered the questions regarding such doctor, if such information was readily available. Claimant has attached to this Questionnaire a copy of such expert's report along with any available x-ray readings, pulmonary function test reports ("PFT") and/or pathology reports considered by Claimant's medical expert in forming his/her opinion in connection with Claimant's Asbestos Lawsuit. In addition to specifying and attaching a copy of the records from which the answer to Part II, subsection 2 may be derived or ascertained and without waiving Claimant's right to do so pursuant to Rule 33(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Claimant has set out in the Questionnaire response the information that is contained in the medical reports and that was readily available to Claimant's attorney in electronic form.
  - b. Claimant further objects to the following questions in Part II, Subsection 2 regarding Claimant's relationship to the diagnosing doctor on the ground that these questions are violative of the attorney-client communication and/or attorney work product privileges, are harassing and seek information that is not relevant to the proceeding. Claimant has additional, specific objections for the questions noted below.



With respect to your relationship to the diagnosing doctor, check all applicable boxes:  Was the diagnosing doctor your personal physician?  Yes  No
Further, Claimant specifically objects to this question on the ground that it is vague and ambiguous
Was the diagnosing doctor paid for the diagnostic services that he/she performed? ☐ Yes ☐ No
If yes, please indicate who paid for the services performed:
Did you retain counsel in order to receive any of the services performed by the diagnosing doctor?  Yes □ No
Further, Claimant specifically objects to this question on the ground that it is violative of the attorn client communication and/or attorney work product privileges, is misleading and cannot be fairly o completely answered with a "yes" or "no." Claimant retained counsel in order to determine wheth he/she had an asbestos-related claim. As part of that analysis, Claimant's counsel referred Claimant to and/or forwarded a copy of Claimant's medical records to a medical doctor qualified to give opin regarding asbestos-related disease.
Was the diagnosing doctor referred to you by counsel?
Further, Claimant objects to this question on the ground that it is violative of the attorney-client
communication and/or attorney work product privileges. Claimant objects to this question since
"referred to you" is vague and ambiguous; therefore, the question cannot be answered with either a
"voe" or "no " The destroyer retained by Claimer than 1. Claimer 1.
"yes" or a "no." The doctor was retained by Claimant through Claimant's counsel to provide expe
medical opinions in Claimant's Asbestos Lawsuit as needed to establish the elements of Claimant's
claim under state law.
Are you aware of any relationship between the diagnosing doctor and your legal counsel?   Yes  No
Further, Claimant objects to this question on the ground that it is violative of the attorney-client
communication and/or attorney work product privileges. Claimant objects to this question since
"relationship" is vague and ambiguous; therefore, the question cannot be answered with either a
"yes" or a "no." The doctor was retained by Claimant through Claimant's counsel to provide expe
medical opinions in Claimant's Asbestos Lawsuit as needed to establish the elements of Claimant's
claim under state law.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing, please see Claimant's Questionnaire responses and documents attached hereto.

# 4. Subsection 3 - Information Regarding Chest X-Ray (Location of X-Ray)

Claimant objects to Part II, Subsection 3 on the ground that it is harassing, and exceeds the scope of discovery in that it seeks information that is not relevant to the subject matter of the estimation proceeding, seeks information from experts that is non-discoverable, and seeks information that is subject to the consulting expert and work product privileges. Claimant further objects to this question on the ground that it is vague and ambiguous in that Claimant may have had multiple chest x-rays taken that do not change or conflict with Claimant's initial diagnosis of an asbestos-related condition and it would be duplicative, unduly burdensome and harassing to require Claimant to complete a separate Part II for each chest x-ray.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing, please refer to Claimant's deposition, if available, and any medical records attached hereto.



# 5. Subsection 4 - Information Regarding Chest X-Ray Reading (Results of X-Ray)

- Claimant objects to Part II, Subsection 4 on the ground that it exceeds the scope of a. discovery in that it seeks information that is not relevant to the subject matter of the estimation proceeding, information from experts that is non-discoverable, and information that is subject to the consulting expert, work product and attorney-client privileges. Claimant further objects to this question as it is not reasonable and necessary to this proceeding and is harassing. Additionally, Claimant objects to this question on the ground that it is duplicative of other questions herein, and thus is unduly burdensome. Claimant objects to this question on the ground that it is vague and ambiguous in that Claimant may have had multiple chest x-rays taken that do not change or conflict with Claimant's initial diagnosis of an asbestos-related condition and it would be duplicative, unduly burdensome and harassing to require Claimant to complete a separate Part II for each chest x-ray. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing, in response to Part II, Subsection 4, Claimant has provided information regarding Claimant's certified B-reader report considered by Claimant's medical expert in forming his/her opinion in connection with Claimant's Asbestos Lawsuit. Claimant has set out in the Questionnaire response the information relating to Claimant's certified B-reader report that was readily available to Claimant's attorney in electronic form.
- b. Claimant objects to Part II, Subsection 4 of the Discovery Questionnaire as violative of the attorney-client communication and/or attorney work product privileges to the extent that it asks: "if Claimant retained counsel in order to receive any of the services performed by the reader;" if "the reader was referred to you by counsel"; and if Claimant is "aware of any relationship between the reader and your legal counsel". Claimant further objects to the following questions in Part II, Subsection 4 regarding Claimant's relationship to the reader on the ground that these questions are harassing and seek information that is not relevant to the proceeding. Claimant has additional, specific objections for the questions noted below.



With respect to your relationship to the reader, check all applicable boxes:	_							
Was the reader paid for the diagnostic services that he/she performed?		Yes		No				
If yes, please indicate who paid for the services performed:								
Did you retain counsel in order to receive any of the services performed by the reader?		Yes		No				
Further, Claimant specifically objects to this question on the ground	l that it i	is violati	ve of the	attorney				
client communication and/or attorney work product privileges, is m	isleading	g and car	nnot be	fairly or				
completely answered with a "yes" or "no." Claimant retained coun	sel in or	der to de	etermine	whether				
he/she had an asbestos-related claim. As part of that analysis, Clain								
to and/or forwarded a copy of Claimant's x-ray to a medical doctor	analifie	to give	oninion	s recordin				
asbestos-related disease.	4	- 10 5110	opinion	3 105				
Was the reader referred to you by counsel? ☐ Yes ☐ No								
Further, Claimant objects to this question on the ground that it is vi	alatina a	£4ha a44		4				
communication and/or atternational and dust not the ground that it is vi	oraniye o	or the att	orney-ci	ient .				
communication and/or attorney work product privileges. Claimant objects to this question since								
"referred to you" is vague and ambiguous; therefore, the question of	annot be	e answer	ed with	either a				
"yes" or a "no." The doctor was retained by Claimant through Cla	imant's	counsel 1	to provi	de expert				
medical opinions in Claimant's Asbestos Lawsuit as needed to estab claim under state law.	lish the c	elements	of Clair	nant's				
Are you aware of any relationship between the reader and your legal counsel?	Yes		No					
Further, Claimant objects to this question on the ground that it is vi	olative o	f the att		ient				
communication and/or attorney work product privileges. Claimant	objects:	to this a	voction c	inca				
"relationship" is vague and ambiguous; therefore, the question cam	objects :	io inis yi		MICE				
"vas" or a "no " The deater was retained by Claimant through Cla	iot ne vi	iswered '	with ett	ici. a				
"yes" or a "no." The doctor was retained by Claimant through Cla	ımant's	counsel 1	to provid	ne expert				
medical opinions in Claimant's Asbestos Lawsuit as needed to estab claim under state law.	lish the e	elements	of Clair	nant's				

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing, please see Claimant's Questionnaire responses and documents attached hereto.

# 6. Subsection 5 - Information Regarding Pulmonary Function Test

a. Claimant objects to Part II, Subsection 5 on the ground that it exceeds the scope of discovery in that it seeks information that is not relevant to the subject matter of the estimation proceeding, that is non-discoverable, and that is subject to the consulting expert, work product and attorney-client privileges. Claimant further objects to this question as it is not reasonable and necessary to this proceeding and is harassing. Additionally, Claimant objects to this question to the extent that it purports to require Claimant to gather and summarize information contained in documents already provided herewith, and is thus obtainable with equal or greater facility by the Debtor. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing, in response to Part II, Subsection 5, Claimant has provided information regarding Claimant's pulmonary function test ("PFT") considered by Claimant's medical expert in forming his/her opinion in connection with Claimant's Asbestos Lawsuit. Claimant has set out in the Questionnaire response the information relating to Claimant's PFT report that was readily available to Claimant's counsel in electronic form.



b. Claimant objects to Part II, subsection 5 of the Discovery Questionnaire as violative of the attorney-client communication and/or attorney work product privileges to the extent that it asks: "if Claimant retained counsel in order to receive any of the services performed by the testing doctor or clinician;" if "the testing doctor or clinician was referred to you by counsel"; and if Claimant is "aware of any relationship between the testing doctor or clinician and your legal counsel". Claimant further objects to the following questions in Part II, Subsection 5 regarding Claimant's relationship to the doctor or clinician who performed the pulmonary function test on the ground that these questions are harassing and seek information that is not relevant to the proceeding. Claimant has additional, specific objections for the questions noted below.

With respect to your relationship to the doctor or clinician who performed the pulmonary function test, check all applicable boxes:
If the test was performed by a doctor, was the doctor your personal physician?
Further, Claimant specifically objects to this question on the ground that it is vague and ambiguous.
Was the testing doctor and/or clinician paid for the diagnostic services that he/she performed? ☐ Yes ☐ No  If yes, please indicate who paid for the services performed:
Did you retain counsel in order to receive any of the services performed by the testing doctor or clinician?   No
Further, Claimant specifically objects to this question on the ground that it is violative of the attorney-
client communication and/or attorney work product privileges, is misleading and cannot be fairly or
completely answered with a "yes" or "no." Claimant retained counsel in order to determine whether
he/she had an asbestos-related claim. As part of that analysis, Claimant's counsel referred Claimant
to a doctor or clinician qualified to perform a pulmonary function test.
Was the testing doctor or clinician referred to you by counsel?
Further, Claimant objects to this question on the ground that it is violative of the attorney-client
communication and/or attorney work product privileges. Claimant objects to this question since
"referred to you" is vague and ambiguous; therefore, the question cannot be answered with either a
"yes" or a "no." The doctor was retained by Claimant through Claimant's counsel to provide expert
medical opinions in Claimant's Asbestos Lawsuit as needed to establish the elements of Claimant's
claim under state law.
Are you aware of any relationship between either the doctor or clinician and your legal counsel? 🗆 Yes 🔻 No
Further, Claimant objects to this question on the ground that it is violative of the attorney-client
communication and/or attorney work product privileges. Claimant objects to this question since
relationship" is vague and ambiguous; therefore, the question cannot be answered with either a "yes"
or a "no." The doctor was retained by Claimant through Claimant's counsel to provide expert medical
opinions in Claimant's Asbestos Lawsuit as needed to establish the elements of Claimant's claim under state law.
If yes, please explain:
** .

c. Claimant objects to the following questions in Part II, Subsection 5 regarding Claimant's relationship to the doctor interpreting the results of the pulmonary function test on the ground that these questions are violative of the attorney-client communication and/or attorney work product privileges, harassing and seek information that is not relevant to



the proceeding. Claimant has additional, specific objections for the questions noted below.

	*****									
With re	spect to your relation	onship to the doc	tor interpre	ting the	e results o	f the pulr	nonary fu	inction te	st, check	al)
Was the	doctor your persona	l physician?			Yes		No			
	Further, Claima		biects to th	is aues	stion on t	he group		is vagne	and ami	nionone
Was the	doctor paid for the s						Yes		No	Jiguous.
	If yes, please indic		•		ed:		103	_	110	
Did you	retain counsel in ord	ler to receive any	of the service	es perfo	rmed by t	he doctor	? 🗆	Yes		No
	Further, Claima	nt specifically o	bjects to th	is aues	tion on t	he groun	d that it	is violati	ve of the	attornev-
	client communic	ation and/or at	tornev wor	k prodi	uct privil	eges, is r	nisleadin	a any ca	nnot be	fairly or
	completely answ	ered with a "ve	s" or "no.	' Clain	nant reta	ined con	nsel in a	rdar to d	atarmine	whather
	he/she had an as	hestos-related c	laim Asn	art of t	hat anal	veie Clai	mantic o	ouncel w	tonnog C	'wneiner
	to a medical doc	tor qualified to	intornret t	ha rocui	nat anaig ltc of Clo	imantic	nuimana	ounsei i e	erreu C	Jamani
Was the	doctor referred to yo	u bu councel?		Yes		No	hannons	ry luncu	on test.	
11 43 1110			_		_			- 643 - 44		
	Further, Claima	nt objects to th	is question	on the	grouna t	nat it is v	/lolative	of the att	torney-cl	ient
	communication :	ma/or attorney	work proc	iuct pri	wileges.	Ciaiman	t objects	to this q	uestion s	ince
	"referred to you	" is vague and a	ambiguous	therei	ore, the	question	cannot b	e answei	red with	either a
	"yes" or a "no."	The doctor wa	is retained	by Clai	imant thi	rough Cl	aimant's	counsel	to provid	le expert
	medical opinions	in Claimant's	Asbestos L	awsuit	as neede	d to estal	blish the	elements	of Clain	nant's
	claim under stat									
Are you	aware of any relation	nship between the	doctor and	your leg	al counsel	? □ Ye	s 🗆	No		
	Further, Claima	nt objects to thi	is question	on the	ground t	bat it is v	iolative ·	of the att	orney-cl	ient
	communication :	ınd/or attorney	work prod	luct pri	vileges.	Claiman	t objects	to this q	uestion s	ince
	"relationship" is	vague and aml	biguous; th	erefore	, the que	stion can	not be a	nswered	with eith	ier a "ves
	or a "no." The	loctor was retai	ined by Cla	imant i	through (	Claiman	t's couns	el to pro	vide exn	ert medica
	opinions in Clair	nant's Asbestos	Lawsuit a	s neede	d to estal	blish the	elements	of Clair	nant's els	aim
-	under state law.									****
	If yes, please expla	in:								
	* * · /									

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing, please see Claimant's Questionnaire responses and documents attached hereto.

# 7. Subsection 6 - Information Regarding Pathology Reports

a. Claimant objects to Part II, Subsection 6 on the ground that it exceeds the scope of discovery in that it seeks information that is not relevant to the subject matter of the estimation proceeding, that is non-discoverable, and that is subject to the consulting expert, work product and attorney-client privileges. Claimant further objects to this question as it is not reasonable and necessary to this proceeding and is harassing. Claimant further objects to this question to the extent that it purports to require Claimant to gather and summarize information contained in documents already provided herewith, and is thus obtainable with equal or greater facility by the Debtor. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing, please see Claimant's Questionnaire responses and documents attached hereto.



b. Claimant objects to Part II, Subsection 6 of the Discovery Questionnaire as violative of the attorney-client communication and/or attorney work product privileges to the extent that it asks: "if Claimant retained counsel in order to receive any of the services performed by the doctor;" if "the doctor was referred to you by counsel"; and if Claimant is "aware of any relationship between the doctor and your legal counsel". Claimant further objects to the following questions in Part II, Subsection 6 regarding Claimant's relationship to the doctor issuing the pathology report on the ground that these questions are harassing and seek information that is not relevant to the proceeding. Claimant has additional, specific objections for the questions noted below.

With respect to your relationship to the doctor	ssuing the nat	hology rer	ort cheel	all anni	icable bo	rae•	
Was the doctor your personal physician?	g tv j	Yes		No.	Cable 502	tes.	
Further, Claimant specifically object	rts to this and				ic wanna	and ami	ianoue
Was the doctor paid for the services that he/she per	formed?	Stion on		Yes		No	nguvus.
If yes, please indicate who paid for the se		ad.		162		NO	
sy year, promot minute mito paragor the be	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	icu.					
Did you retain counsel in order to receive any of the	e services perf	ormed by f	he doctor?	п	Yes		No
Further, Claimant specifically object	ts to this que	stion on t	he groun	d that it			
client communication and/or attorn	ev work prod	luct privi	leges, is n	nisleadin	o and ca	nnot he	fairly ar
completely answered with a "yes" o	r "no." Clai	mant reta	ined com	nsel in a	rder ta d	etermine	whathar
he/she had an asbestos-related clain	l.					010111111	, who the
Was the doctor referred to you by counsel?	] Yes		No				
Further, Claimant objects to this qu	estion on the	ground t		iolative	of the att	arnev-cl	ient
communication and/or attorney wo	rk product pi	rivileges.	Claiman	t objects	to this a	nestion s	ince
"referred to you" is vague and amb	iguous: there	fore, the	question :	cannot h	e answei	ed with	aithar a
"yes" or a "no." The doctor was re	tained by Cla	aimant th	rough Ch	aimant's	counsel	to provid	la avnart
medical opinions in Claimant's Asb	estos Lawsnii	as neede	d to estal	olish the	elemento	of Clair	nontic
claim under state law.				Jiish the	CICIIICIE	of Class	nant 5
Are you aware of any relationship between the doc	tor and your le	gal counse	12 □ Ve	e $\square$ N	1		
Further, Claimant objects to this qu	estion on the	ground t	hat it is v	iolative	nf the att	ornav_el	iont
communication and/or attorney wo	k product n	ivileges	Claiman	t ahierte	to this a	uaction c	inaa
"relationship" is vague and ambigu	ous: therefor	e the and	ction con	not he o	newarad	with sith	ince
or a "no." The doctor was retained	hv Claimant	through	Claimant	He counc	al to pro	with eith	era yes
opinions in Claimant's Asbestos Lav	venit as nead	ad to acto	blich the	olomonto	er to pro	viue expi	: )
state law.	TOUR MO HEED	eu to esta	minn the	elemén (2	or Clan	nant's cl	ann unue

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing, please see Claimant's Questionnaire responses and documents attached hereto.

# 8. Subsection 7 - Medical Treatment From Doctor for Condition Alleged

Claimant objects to this question on the ground that it exceeds the scope of discovery in that it seeks information that is not relevant to the subject matter of the estimation proceeding, that is non-discoverable, and that is subject to the consulting expert, work product and attorney-client privileges. Claimant further objects to this question as it is harassing. Additionally, Claimant objects to Part II, Subsection 7 of the Discovery Questionnaire to the extent that it asks if Claimant "retained counsel in order to receive any of the services performed by the doctor," on the ground that it is violative of the attorney-client communication and/or attorney work product



privileges, is misleading and cannot be fairly or completely answered with a "yes" or "no." Claimant retained counsel in order to determine whether he/she had an asbestos-related claim.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing, please see Claimant's Questionnaire responses and documents attached thereto.

# PART III: DIRECT EXPOSURE TO GRACE ASBESTOS-CONTAINING PRODUCTS

Claimant objects to Part III in its entirety on the ground that it is onerous, unduly burdensome and harassing in that it would require a great amount of time, labor and expense to create a chart of exposure to Debtor's products in the format requested by Debtor. Claimant further objects to this question to the extent that it requires Claimant to compile or summarize information made available to Debtor that is obtainable with equal or greater facility by the Debtor. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, the information responsive to this request may be derived from the documents attached to Claimant's Questionnaire, including, where available, Claimant's Work History Sheet ("WHS"), Claimant's Answers to Interrogatories filed in connection with Claimant's Asbestos Lawsuit (referred to in the Questionnaire response as "interrogatory responses") and the work history sheets of some of Claimant's coworkers.

# PART IV: INDIRECT EXPOSURE TO GRACE ASBESTOS-CONTAINING PRODUCTS

- 1. Claimant objects to Part IV, question 1 to the extent that it is vague and ambiguous with regard to the use of the terms "contact/proximity" and "injured person". Claimant further objects to this question on the ground that it implicitly asserts unproven conclusions as established facts. Specifically, Claimant may have been injured by exposure to Grace products as a result of contact or proximity to another person, but not necessarily an "injured" person. To the best of Claimant's ability, Claimant understands the question to ask whether Claimant's injury is caused solely by contact/proximity with another person. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing, please see Claimant's Questionnaire responses and the documents attached hereto.
- Claimant objects to Part IV, question 2 to the extent that it is vague and ambiguous with regard to the use of the undefined term "Other Injured Person". Specifically, there may not be an "Other Injured Person" responsible for Claimant's injuries. Claimant further objects to this question to the extent that it requires Claimant to compile or summarize information made available to Debtor that is obtainable with equal or greater facility by the Debtor, or that is actually attached to this Questionnaire. Additionally, Claimant objects to this question as it exceeds the permissible scope of discovery in that it is not relevant to the subject matter of the estimation proceeding. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing, please see Claimant's Questionnaire responses and the documents attached hereto.
- 3. Claimant objects to Part IV, question 3 to the extent that it is vague and ambiguous with regard to the use of the undefined term "Other Injured Person". Specifically, there may not be an



"Other Injured Person" responsible for Claimant's injuries. Claimant further objects to this question to the extent that it requires Claimant to compile or summarize information made available to Debtor that is obtainable with equal or greater facility by the Debtor, or that is actually attached to this Questionnaire. Additionally, Claimant objects to this question as it exceeds the permissible scope of discovery in that it is not relevant to the subject matter of the estimation proceeding. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing, please see Claimant's Questionnaire responses and the documents attached hereto.

- 4. Claimant objects to Part IV, question 4 to the extent that it is vague and ambiguous with regard to the use of the undefined term "Other Injured Person". Specifically, there may not be an "Other Injured Person" responsible for Claimant's injuries. Claimant further objects to this question to the extent that it requires Claimant to compile or summarize information made available to Debtor that is obtainable with equal or greater facility by the Debtor, or that is actually attached to this Questionnaire. Additionally, Claimant objects to this question as it exceeds the permissible scope of discovery in that it is not relevant to the subject matter of the estimation proceeding. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing, please see Claimant's Questionnaire responses and the documents attached hereto.
- 5. Claimant objects to Part IV, question 5 to the extent that it is vague and ambiguous with regard to the use of the undefined term "Other Injured Person". Specifically, there may not be an "Other Injured Person" responsible for Claimant's injuries. Claimant further objects to this question to the extent that it requires Claimant to compile or summarize information made available to Debtor that is obtainable with equal or greater facility by the Debtor, or that is actually attached to this Questionnaire. Additionally, Claimant objects to this question as it exceeds the permissible scope of discovery in that it is not relevant to the subject matter of the estimation proceeding. Claimant also objects to this question on the ground that Claimant may not know the specific day, month, and year of another person's exposure and therefore cannot answer the question. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing, please see Claimant's Questionnaire responses and the documents attached hereto.
- 6. Claimant objects to Part IV, question 6 to the extent that it is vague and ambiguous with regard to the use of the undefined term "Other Injured Person". Specifically, there may not be an "Other Injured Person" responsible for Claimant's injuries. Claimant further objects to this question to the extent that it requires Claimant to compile or summarize information made available to Debtor that is obtainable with equal or greater facility by the Debtor, or that is actually attached to this Questionnaire. Additionally, Claimant objects to this question as it exceeds the permissible scope of discovery in that it is not relevant to the subject matter of the estimation proceeding. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing, please see Claimant's Questionnaire responses and the documents attached hereto.
- 7. Claimant objects to Part IV, question 7 to the extent that it is vague and ambiguous with regard to the use of the undefined term "Other Injured Person". Specifically, there may not be an "Other Injured Person" responsible for Claimant's injuries. Claimant further objects to this question to the extent that it requires Claimant to compile or summarize information made



available to Debtor that is obtainable with equal or greater facility by the Debtor, or that is actually attached to this Questionnaire. Additionally, Claimant objects to this question as it exceeds the permissible scope of discovery in that it is not relevant to the subject matter of the estimation proceeding. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing, please see Claimant's Questionnaire responses and the documents attached hereto.

- 8. Claimant objects to Part IV, question 8 to the extent that it requires Claimant to compile or summarize information made available to Debtor that is obtainable with equal or greater facility by the Debtor. Claimant further objects to the use of the term "Nature" in that it is vague and ambiguous. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing, please see Claimant's Questionnaire responses and the documents attached hereto.
- 9. Claimant objects to Part IV, question 9 to the extent that it requires Claimant to compile or summarize information made available to Debtor that is obtainable with equal or greater facility by the Debtor. Claimant further objects to the use of the term "Nature" in that it is vague and ambiguous. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing, please see Claimant's Questionnaire responses and the documents attached hereto.
- 10. Claimant objects to Part IV, question 10 to the extent that it requires Claimant to compile or summarize information made available to Debtor that is obtainable with equal or greater facility by the Debtor. Additionally, Claimant objects to this question on the ground that Claimant may not recall the exact day, month, and year his or her exposure began or ended, and, in that regard, this question is unduly burdensome. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing, please see Claimant's Questionnaire responses and the documents attached hereto.

# PART V: EXPOSURE TO NON-GRACE ASBESTOS-CONTAINING PRODUCTS

Claimant objects to Part V as it exceeds the permissible scope of discovery in that it is not relevant to the subject matter of the estimation proceeding, nor reasonably calculated to lead to admissible evidence therein. Claimant objects to this interrogatory on the ground that it is unduly burdensome, onerous and harrassing in that it would require a great amount of time, labor and expense to create a chart of exposure in the format requested by Debtor and then to create a separate chart for each party against which Claimant has filed an asbestos lawsuit or claim. Claimant further objects to Part V to the extent that it requires Claimant to compile or summarize information made available to Debtor that is obtainable with equal or greater facility by the Debtor. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, the information responsive to this request may be derived from the documents attached to Claimant's Questionnaire, including, where available, Claimant's Work History Sheet, Claimant's Answers to Interrogatories filed in connection with Claimant's Asbestos Lawsuit ("interrogatory responses") and the work history sheets of some of Claimant's coworkers. In addition, Claimant has attached to the Questionnaire a List of Parties Against which a Lawsuit or Claim was Filed ("List of Parties").



# PART VI: EMPLOYMENT HISTORY

Claimant objects to Part VI on the ground that it is unduly burdensome and harassing and it would require a great amount of time, labor and expense to complete this section of the Questionnaire in the format requested by Debtors. Claimant further objects to this question because it requires Claimant to compile or summarize information from Claimant's Social Security records that is obtainable with equal or greater facility by the Debtor. Claimant further objects to providing information, including but not limited to, the occupation and industry codes for employers or jobsites where Claimant has not alleged any asbestos exposure as it exceeds the scope of permissible discovery in that it is not relevant to the subject matter of the estimation proceeding, nor reasonably calculated to lead to admissible evidence therein, and is harassing to Claimant.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, the information responsive to this request may be derived from the documents attached to Claimant's Questionnaire, including, where available, Claimant's Itemized Statement of Earnings prepared by the Social Security Administration, Claimant's Work History Sheet, and Claimant's deposition, if available.

# PART VII: LITIGATION AND CLAIMS REGARDING ASBESTOS AND/OR SILICA

# Subsection a. - Litigation

- 1. Claimant objects to Part VII, Subsection a, question 1 as it is overly broad in that it is not limited to asbestos- related personal injury lawsuits; and further, it is not limited to the lawsuit in which Debtor was sued. Claimant responds to this entire Subsection a (questions I through 7) as if the question were so limited. Claimant further objects to this subpart to the extent that it requires Claimant to summarize information made available to Debtor that is obtainable with equal or greater facility by the Debtor, or that is actually attached to this Questionnaire. Responding to Part VII, Subsection a in the format in Debtor's Questionnaire is harassing and unduly burdensome. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing, please see Claimant's Questionnaire responses and the documents attached hereto. Claimant's counsel does not represent Claimant in a lawsuit regarding silica.
- 2. Claimant objects to Part VII, Subsection a, question 2, to the extent that it requires Claimant to compile or summarize information made available to Debtor that is obtainable with equal or greater facility by the Debtor. Claimant further objects to this subpart as it is overly broad in that it is not limited to asbestos- related personal injury lawsuits. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing, please see Claimant's Questionnaire responses and the documents attached hereto.
- 3. Claimant objects to Part VII, Subsection a, question 3 on the ground that it is harrassing in that Grace knows equally as well as Claimant whether or not it was named as a defendant in Claimant's lawsuit, if any. Claimant objects to this subpart as it is



overly broad in that it is not limited to asbestos-related personal injury lawsuits. Further, Claimant objects to this subpart on the ground that it exceeds the permissible scope of discovery in that it seeks information that is not relevant to the estimation proceeding, nor reasonably calculated to lead to admissible evidence therein. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing, please see Claimant's Questionnaire responses and the documents attached hereto.

- 4. Claimant objects to Part VII, Subsection a, question 4 on the ground that it seeks information that is neither relevant, nor necessary to the estimation proceeding, nor reasonably calculated to lead to admissible evidence therein. Whether a particular defendant has been dismissed has no bearing on Debtor's several share of the liability. Additionally, Claimant objects on the ground that it is unduly burdensome to provide the basis for dismissal for each of the dismissed defendants, if any. Claimant further objects to this subpart as it is overly broad in that it is not limited to asbestos-related personal injury lawsuits. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing, please see Claimant's Questionnaire responses and the documents attached hereto.
- 5. Claimant objects to Part VII, Subsection a, question 5 on the ground that it exceeds the scope of discovery in that it seeks information that is not relevant, nor necessary to the estimation proceeding, nor reasonably calculated to lead to admissible evidence therein. The existence and amount of any verdict or judgment against any defendant other than Debtor has no bearing on Debtor's several share of the liability. Claimant objects to this subpart as it is overly broad in that it is not limited to asbestos- related personal injury lawsuits. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing, please see Claimant's Questionnaire responses and the documents attached hereto.
- Claimant objects to Part VII, Subsection a, question 6 and each of its subparts regarding settlements reached in the lawsuit as it exceeds the permissible scope of discovery in that it is not relevant to the subject matter of the estimation proceeding, nor reasonably calculated to lead to admissible evidence therein and requests privileged or confidential information. Specifically, the terms of the settlement agreements, if any, including the settlement amounts, if any, are irrelevant to an aggregate estimate of Debtor's liability. Claimant further objects to this subpart as it is overly broad to the extent that it seeks information beyond asbestos- related personal injury lawsuits. Settlements with other defendants are irrelevant to Debtor's several share of the liability, and Debtor would get a set-off or credit for such settlements only for the cases that were tried all the way to judgment, which clearly will not happen in the context of the present proceeding. Further, for a majority of defendants, any settlement agreements are subject to a confidentiality agreement.

Claimant specifically objects to providing the "disease or condition alleged" and the "the disease or condition settled" (Part VII.a.6(c) and (d)) on the ground that it is ambiguous and harassing. Claimant filed a lawsuit alleging Claimant suffered injuries proximately caused by Claimant's exposure to asbestos-containing products designed,



manufactured and sold by the Defendants named in the lawsuit, and any settlements were related to those allegations. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing, please see Claimant's Questionnaire responses and the List of Parties attached hereto. Claimant has provided information regarding the status of his/her claim against the Defendants named in Claimant's Asbestos Lawsuit in the attached List of Parties.

7. Claimant objects to Part VII, Subsection a, question 7 on the ground that it is overly broad and unduly burdensome. Further, Claimant's deposition testimony is duplicative of information already provided herein. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing, please see Claimant's Questionnaire responses and the documents attached hereto.

# Subsection b - Claims

- 1. Claimant objects to Part VII, Subsection b, question 1 as it exceeds the permissible scope of discovery in that it is not relevant to the subject matter of the estimation proceeding, nor reasonably calculated to lead to admissible evidence therein, and requests privileged or confidential information. Claimant further objects that responding to Part VII, Subsection b in the format in Debtors' Questionnaire is harassing and unduly burdensome. Additionally, Claimant objects on the ground that this question is overly broad in that it is not limited to asbestos-related personal injury claims. Claimant responds to this entire subsection b (questions 1 through 7) as if the questions were so limited. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing, Claimant has provided information regarding the status of his asbestos claim against any asbestos trust in the attached List of Parties.
- Claimant objects to Part VII, Subsection b, questions 2, 3 and 4 on the ground that it seeks information that is neither relevant, nor necessary to the estimation proceeding, nor reasonably calculated to lead to admissible evidence therein. The date and entity against whom a claim was submitted has no bearing on Debtor's several share of the liability. Additionally, Claimant objects on the ground that this question is overly broad in that it is not limited to asbestos-related personal injury claims. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing, please see the attached List of Parties.
- 3. Claimant objects to Part VII, Subsection b, questions 5 and 6 regarding settlements with an asbestos trust as it exceeds the permissible scope of discovery in that it is not relevant to the subject matter of the estimation proceeding, nor reasonably calculated to lead to admissible evidence therein, and requests privileged or confidential information. The settlement amounts are not relevant to an aggregate estimate of Debtor's liability or to Debtor's several share of the liability. Additionally, Claimant objects on the ground that this question is overly broad in that it is not limited to asbestos- related personal injury claims. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing, Claimant has noted the settled claims on the attached List of Parties.



4. Claimant objects to Part VII, Subsection b, question 7 on the ground that it seeks information that is neither relevant, nor necessary to the estimation proceeding, nor reasonably calculated to lead to admissible evidence therein. Whether a particular defendant has been dismissed has no bearing on Debtor's several share of the liability. Additionally, Claimant objects on the ground that it is unduly burdensome to provide the basis for dismissal for each of the dismissed defendants, if any, and it is overly broad in that it is not limited to asbestos- related personal injury lawsuits. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing, please see Claimant's Questionnaire responses and the documents attached hereto.

# PART VIII: CLAIMS BY DEPENDENTS OR RELATED PERSONS

Claimant objects to Part VIII on the ground that information regarding dependents or related persons who sued the Debtors before April 2, 2001 is equally available to Debtors. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing, Claimant has provided information regarding Claimant's spouse where available. Please see attached interrogatory responses and Debtors' own records for information regarding dependents.



# **QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES**

Claimant hereby incorporates by reference all of the foregoing general and specific objections into Claimant's Questionnaire responses and has provided the following responses subject to those objections. Because the burden of deriving or ascertaining the answer is substantially the same for Debtor as for Claimant, Claimant has specified in Claimant's Questionnaire response the document(s) from which the answer may be derived, including but not limited to Claimant's medical records, Claimant's Work History Sheet (referred to in the Questionnaire response as "WHS"), Claimant's Answers to Interrogatories filed in connection with Claimant's Asbestos Lawsuit (referred to in the Questionnaire response as "interrogatory responses"), work history sheets of Claimant's coworkers (referred to in the Questionnaire responses as "Coworker WHS"), Claimant's Itemized Statement of Earnings prepared by the Social Security Administration (referred to in the Questionnaire responses as "Statement of Earnings") and Claimant's deposition. In addition, Claimant has compiled information responsive to the Questionnaire in the attached List of Parties Against which a Lawsuit or Claim Was Filed (referred to in the Questionnaire responses as "List of Parties").



Respectfully submitted,

BARON & BUDD A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION 3102 Oak Lawn Avenue, Suite 1100 Dallas, Texas 75219 PHONE NO.: (214) 521-3605 FAX NO.: (214) 520-1181

By:

RUSSELL BUDD TX BAR NO. 03312400 1

# BARON & BUDD

A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS SUITE 1100 3102-QAK LAWN AVENUE DALLAS, TEXAS 75219-4281 (214) 521-3605

TELÉCOPIER (214) 520-1181

July 10, 2006



STEPHEN T. BLACKBURN MX & CA RANDALL K. PULLIAM (TX # AR) JOHN L. LANGDOC (TX & CAL AMANDA R. TYLER ROXANNE MCKENZIE LINTON MAON DENYSE F. CLANCY RYAN C. LEGGIERO (TX & CO) BART DALTON OXAG DAVID L. GREEN CLAIRE T. BRIGGS M. CRISTINA SANCHEZ STEPHEN LIU TINA POTTER SHARON D. BAUTISTA CHARLES E. SOECHTING, JR. CAROLIN K. SHINING KASSOM PAUL ML LYNCH (TX & AR) CARRIE A. HILL SHERRY L. TALTON SUSAN I AUREA LASALLE ELIZABETH A. SALINAS

ROBERT D. CRAIN

VIRGINIA ADAMS MARENTETTE

TIFFANY NEWLIN DICKENSON OX AUS

J. H. GRIMES EXECU

LAURA M. CABUTTO SCOTT R. FRIELING

NATALIE F. DUNCAN

REY FERNÁNDEZ

DAVID T. RITTER

CHRIS J. PANATIFA

CHAD R. COTTEN

D. CARLMONEY (TX & MT)

BRIAN K. PEACOCK ERIN ANDERSON FARRIS

JORY D. LANGE, JR.

EDMOND L MARTIN DONNA J. BLEVINS

CARLA M. BURKE (XAM)

JACQUELINE MONTEJANO

STEPHANIE BROOKS LESMES

RENÉE MELANÇON THERESANELSON RUCK BY A OH OH

MARTY A. MORRIS

FREDERICK M. BARON RUSSELL W. BUDD (TX & MG) BRENT M. ROSENTHAL LISA A. BLUE, PH.D. STEVEN D. WOLENS MELISSA K. HUTTS (TX & MO) STEVE BAUGHMAN JENSEN ALLEN M. STEWART (IX LPA) LAURA BAUGHMAN (TX 8 M) LAURIE J. MEGGESIN ALAN B. RICH (IXAL) **ELLEN A. PRESBY** SCOTT SUMMY (TX & NC) MISTY A. FARRIS KEVIN D. MCHARGUE JAMES D. PIEL (TX 1 OR) S. ANN SAUCER (TX 1 LA) LANCE A. POOL (TX & OK) JOHN J. SPILLANE BEN K. DUBOSE LAWRENCE G. GETTYS (TX & LA)

FRANK E. GOODRICH CELESTE A. EVANGELISTI (IX.AR & MY CHARLA G. ALDOUS CARY L. MCDOUGAL STEVEN T. BARON

OF COUNSEL

JANICE PENNINGTON (TX & AZ) JOHN L. YATES BRUCE W. STECKLER

DIANE M. ANDREW (J. & MO GM)
SAM T. RICHARD (K. & GM)
CHRISTINA E. MANCUSO
SCOTT MORRISON
WESLEY K. YOUNG
STEPHEN C. JOHNSTON
WILLIAM K. TAPSCOTT, JR. (TX. 4L & EQ
AMY J. SHAHAN
PATRICK O'NEAL (JA GM)
ANDREA S. BOURNE

# VIA FEDERAL EXPRESS

Rust Consulting, Inc.
Claims Processing Agent
RE: W.R. Grace & Co. Bankruptcy
201 S. Lyndale Avenue
Faribault, MN 55021

RE: W.R. Grace Asbestos Personal Injury Questionnaires

Dear Sir/Madam:

Enclosed please find ten (10) CDs with Claimant's Objections and Responses to the W.R. Grace Asbestos Personal Injury Questionnaire for the Claimants listed on the attached Exhibit 1. Because the burden of deriving or ascertaining the answer is substantially the same for Debtor as for Claimant, Claimant has specified in Claimant's Questionnaire response the document(s) from which the answer may be derived. Due to the volume, these documents are not attached to the Questionnaire, but will be made available for inspection and/or copying in the Dallas offices of Baron & Budd, P.C. during reasonable office hours upon reasonable notice.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Natalie F. Duncan

NFD:brw

Enclosure

J:\Natalie\wr grace\rust consulting 71006.wpd

TUE Deliver By: 11JUL06

MSP



FedEx | Ship Manager | Label 7927 9120 3134

rom: Origin-ID: (214)521-3605 David Belcher BARON AND BUDD 3102 Oak Lawn Ave. Suite 1100 Dallas, TX 75219

Ship Date: 10JUL06 Ackygt: 5 LB System#: 9472717/INET2500 Accoun#: S \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

BILL SENDER SHIP TO: (800)220-4453
W.R. Grace Bankruptcy
Rust Consulting, Inc.
201 S. Lyndale Avenue

Delivery Addrèss Bar Code

Faribault, MN 55021

TRK# 7927 9120 3134 FORM PRIORITY OVERNIGHT

SU-NM-55021

Page 1 of 1